DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 661 EC 122 725

TITLE In Retrospect 1978-79: Special Education Research.
INSTITUTION Dallas Independent School District, Tex. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 130p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; Data Collection; Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; Infancy; Intervention; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Recordkeeping; Severely Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS Child Find; *Final Reports; Texas (Dallas)

ABSTRACT

The volume is a composite of final reports written for nine special education research and evaluation studies conducted by the Dallas (Texas) Independent School District during the 1978-79 school year. Each report includes three components: an executive summary of research or evaluation questions and responses; an abstract with information on program objectives, sampling, design, and outcomes; and "googles," brief notes on critical aspects of the study. Three program studies are covered: formation of a special education data base of demographic information, a context evaluation of the implementation and operation of the special education program, and an evaluation of Child Find services. Six special projects are included: three on KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems), an early intervention program for developmentally delayed and physically handicapped children 0 to 5 years old; a project for severely/profoundly handicapped students; a structured environment approach with the emotionally disturbed; and the Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Centers program which provided career training for mildly handicapped secondary students. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181661

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IN RETROSPECT 1978-79
SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. J. Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DALLAS, TEXAS
OCTOBER, 1979

EC132725

IN RETROSPECT 1978-79 IS A COMPOSITE OF FINAL REPORTS WRITTEN FOR EVERY SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND EVALUATION STUDY CONDUCTED DURING THE 1978-79 SCHOOL YEAR. EACH REPORT INCLUDES:

1) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE SUMMARY PRESENTS EACH RESEARCH OR EVALUATION QUESTION AND A BRIEF RESPONSE.

2) ABSTRACT

THE ABSTRACT CONTAINS MORE COMPREHENSIVE INFORMATION AND INCLUDES PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, SAMPLING, DESIGN, AND OUTCOMES.

3) GOOGLES

THIS SINGLE PAGE LISTS GOOGLES FOR EACH STUDY. GOOGLES ATTEMPT TO REPORT THE CRITICAL THINGS TO KNOW AND REMEMBER. BY DEFINITION, GOOGLES MAY CONSUME ONLY PART OF A SINGLE PAGE OF PAPER.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

THE STUDIES REPORTED IN THIS DOCUMENT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN COMPLETED WITHOUT THE EXCELLENT COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATORS AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Table of Contents

Special Education Program Studies

Data Base 1

Executive Summary 2
Abstract 4
Googles 12

Context Evaluation 13

Executive Summary 14
Abstract 16
Googles 20

Child Find 21

Executive Summary 22
Abstract 23
Googles 30

Special Projects

KIDS (Early Intervention) 31

Executive Summary 32
Abstract 34
Googles 42

KIDS Outreach 43

Executive 44
Abstract 46
Googles 55

KIDS Theoretical Control 56

Executive Summary 57
Abstract 59
Googles 68

Severely/Profoundly Handicapped 69

Executive Summary 70
Abstract 72
Googles 82

Table of Contents (continued)

Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed . . 83

Executive Summary 84
Abstract 86
Googles 96

Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Center 97

Executive Summary 98
Abstract 102
Googles 125

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA BASE

SP79-415-31-08

Karen Cortell Reisman, B.S.
Michael A. Holt
Jenci J. Kocsis, M.S.
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and
Development

Dallas, Texas
September, 1979

Executive Summary

Special Education Data Base

Evaluators: Karen Cortell Reisman
Michael A. Holt
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: What parameters described the special education data base in terms of record definition and data collection procedures for the 1978-79 year?

The special education data base, during its fourth year of operation, continued to provide needed information to designated management. Primarily, the information consisted of student demographic data such as name, date of birth, handicap and instructional arrangement, etc. Validity sampling in December and again in March indicated an error rate reduction (6.4% to 2.1%) in terms of special education students not being listed in the date base.

Question 2: What kinds of information were available to decision-makers as a result of the 1978-79 data base operations?

Information was available from the data base for completion of the Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the Texas Education Agency and other TEA reports. Special education professionals made use of student and faculty listings generated periodically. Information from the data base was also requested by management on an ad hoc basis on 90 different occasions during the year.

Question 3: What were the costs associated with data base operations?

Cost of data base operations, calculated in terms of staff salaries, showed the following cost figures:

Function	Dollars
Routine reports	$12,354
Data collection and maintenance	$ 6,554
New software development	$11,530
Special projects	$ 8,300
Unscheduled reports	$ 3,050
Total	$41,788

This limited cost analysis did not attempt to calculate the benefits realized from the data base expenditure (note that the figure of $41,788 did not include computer time costs). However, a cost analysis conducted by management indicated that computer processing for the annual statistical report to TEA was considerably more cost effective than manual processing.

Question 4: What plans were developed and implemented for the computerized monitoring of special education instructonal equipment and materials?

Preliminary plans were developed by special education management to develop a computerized inventory system of all valuable special education equipment and instructional materials. However, no definitive steps were taken toward the computerization of this system.

Question 5: What contingency plans, if any, were developed for data base expansion?

Modifications for the 1979-80 data base include the following:

1) computer terminals placed in subdistrict special education offices.

2) immediate access to data base by professional staff in the field.

3) storage and retrieval of student appraisal/ placement events.

4) storage and retrieval of detailed student transportation data.

The above modifications will give management and staff the opportunity for more efficient program operation.

Abstract

Special Education Data Base

Evaluators: Karen Cortell Reisman
Michael A. Holt
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: The special education data base evolved four years ago to meet the increasing information needs of both special and regular education administrators. These needs arose from a host of administrative tasks and issues including budget and program planning, federal and state reporting requests, student enrollment and appraisal/placement monitoring, due process procedures, and the need for more precise and accountable management. During its fourth year of operation, the data base, maintained by Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems personnel, continued to provide needed information to designated management.

Prior to this year diagnosticians (N=24) and speech pathologists (N=78) reported data for the computer file. However, due to a pilot appraisal plan initiated this year in the Northwest subdistrict, some additional psychologists and home-school coordinators (N=18) assumed this responsibility along with the diagnosticians. Primarily, the information collected by these professionals, also known as Responsible Team Members (RTMs), consisted of demographic data about students needed during day-to-day routine of special education management. The RTM recorded the data on coding forms. All variables, excluding the name, were written in an alpha or numeric code. The coding forms were mailed on a daily basis to a central office where they were validated, keypunched, and entered to the computer file.

The basic function of the 1978-79 special education data base was to build onto the existing computer file while continuing to provide information to special education administrators. Variations of student and faculty rosters, current to the week of distribution, were given to special education coordinators, other special education management, and the Responsible Team Members corresponding to six-week District reporting periods.

A major objective of the data base was the generation of reports to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) necessary for funding purposes. The TEA Survey Package generated the total number of children between ages 3-5 and ages 6-21 by handicapping condition. The Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey tallied, by each school, total special education students by sex, race, instructional arrangement and handicap.

Finally, statistical tabulations essential for the Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the TEA were generated by a set of computer routines developed this year by data base personnel.

The data base was also utilized to provide spontaneous information requested by management. The computer system enabled administrators to be more responsive to such needs in terms of both time and energy. The types of information requested usually dealt with totals and percentages of special education students with race, subdistrict, age or handicap as potential variables. Mailing labels were also computer generated at different times which economized on secretarial time when letters were sent to staff or parents.

Sample: The sample for the data base included the special education staff (N=875) and all the students who received special education services (N=10,238) during the 1978-79 shcool year. There were ten identifiable groups of special education teachers:

1) Special education management staff

2) Teachers of special class units on DISD campuses

3) Teachers of special class units at non-DISD campuses

4) Speech pathologists

5) Educational diagnosticians

6) Non-DISD teachers at non-DISD campuses (contracted services)

7) Teachers in the regional-deaf program

8) Teachers in the hospital-homebound program

9) Teachers in the blind-visual program

10) Teacher aids

Evaluation Design: The concept of an evaluation design was not generally applicable to the data base study, but the following three evaluation questions provide a framework for reporting results.

2.1 What parameters described the special education data base in terms of record definition and data collection procedures for the 1978-79 year?

2.2 What kinds of information were available to decision-makers as a result of the 1978-79 data base operations?

2.2.1 What were the number and frequency of kinds of data generated on a routine, periodic basis?

2.2.2 What were the number and frequency of kinds of data disseminated on request by management?

2.3 What were the costs associated with data base operations?

2.4 What plans were developed and implemented for the computerized monitoring of special education instructional equipment and materials?

2.5 What contingency plans, if any, were developed for data base expansion?

Evaluation Results:

1. The special education data base in its fourth year of operation, was successfully utilized to generate information needed by special education management in the day-to-day operations of the program.

2. Information was available from the data base for completion of the Annual Special Educaion Statistical Report to the Texas Education Agency. Special education managers also made use of student and teacher listings as generated periodically throughout the year. These lists provided a central information source that was available for quick reference and that was the most current possible.

3. The following table categorizes the frequency and types of reports generated on a routine basis.

Table 1

Types and Frequencies of Routine Data

Type of Report	Schedule for Generation
1) Faculty rosters	6 weeks
2) Student rosters	6 weeks
3) Child Find Report	Monthly
4) TEA Survey Package	Annually (October)
5) Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey	Annually (October)
6) Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the TEA	Annually (June)
7) Letters of notification to parents about special class placement	Annually (June)
8) Letters of notification to parents about student transportation eligibility	Annually (June)
9) Computer punch cards of students necessary for class scheduling process	Annually (June)

4. Information from the data base was requested on an ad hoc basis on 90 different occasions during the year. The following table categorizes the frequency and types of data and resources needed by management.

Table 2

Types and Frequencies of Ad Hoc Requested Data

Types of Information	Number of Times Requested
1) Routine student/faculty rosters at less than 6-weeks intervals	16
2) Mailing labels for faculty and/or students	13
3) Student rosters by handicap with age, location and instructional arrangement as variables	12
4) Rosters of students eligible for or receiving transportation	12
5) Student rosters by class type (i.e., Early Childhood Unit)	12
6) Student rosters by ethnicity	6
7) Student rosters by subdistrict listed by Student Services number	6
8) Summary rosters of speech students	4
9) Student address rosters	3
10) Student rosters by grade level	3
11) Miscellaneous tabulations	3
Total	90

5. A computerized method of class scheduling for the 1979-80 school year was implemented in the summer months, using a modified version of the process designed two years ago. The method, which minimized work time considerably, was executed with the close cooperation of the coordinators and their facilitators.

6. A set of programs were developed to project next-year school locations for special education students based upon their neighborhood elementary schools and the district-wide computer feeder system. The enrollment projections were designed to help management allocate class units relative to anticipated student enrollments.

7. The additional functions of and revisions to the 1978-79 special education data base were:

   1) collection of data on NCR coding forms so that Responsible Team Members could retain a copy of all transactions

   2) Generation of new software necessary to disseminate:

      a. The Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the TEA
      b. The class summary roster
      c. The transportation cost analysis report
      d. The monthly Child Find report.

   3) Increase of data collectors to include some psychologists and home-school coordinators

   4) Deletion of appraisal status information.

8. Two validity checks were made on the accuracy of information reported to the data base. Results are indicated in Table 3. As previously mentioned, some psychologists and home-school coordinators assumed data collection responsibility this year. Yet, the validity checks indicated the percentage of errors had decreased over time despite the additional people who reported data.

Table 3

Validity Check Summary

	December 1978		March 1979	
	N	% error	N	% error
Teachers contacted:	33	-	60	-
Total student population listed on data base for selected teachers:	344	-	710	-
Total number of students that teachers reported should be dropped:	23	6.6%	39	5.5%
Total number of students that teachers reported should be added:	22	6.4%	15	2.1%

9. Preliminary plans were developed by special education management to develop a computerized inventory system of all valuable special education equipment and instructional materials. However, no definitive steps were taken towards the computerization of this system.

10. An analysis of the costs of data processing revealed that, at least in the large school district, which has computer capability, the costs for computer-prepared individual reports were less than those which were manually prepared (Chowning, C. O. Improving the Usefulness and the Cost-effectiveness of Reporting with a Computerized Data Processing System. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,, Nova University.) Table 4 indicates the staff time expenditure and cost for the manual preparation of the Annual Special Education Statistical Report was greater than for the computer generated process.

Table 4

Cost Comparisons

	Manually Prepared 1973-74 Annual Report	Computer Generated 1977-78 Annual Report
Number of reported students	9,193 students	9,244 students
Staff time expenditure for report preparation	4 months	1 1/2 months
Salary costs	$21,651	$15,514

The cost of complete data base operations was ascertained by dividing the system into five major functions and charting the hour costs utilized to perform each service. Table 5 indicates the total number of days spent on each data base function given two computer programmers, one assistant evaluator, principal evaluator, and secretary. Assignment of cost to each function was achieved by totalling each employee's daily salary multipled by the number of days utilized for each function.

Table 5

Data Base Cost Analysis[a]

Data Base Function	Total of Days utilized by Staff	Total Cost
Routine report generation	175	$12,354.39
Data collection and system maintenance	114	$ 6,554.11
New software development[b]	145	$11,529.74
Special projects[c]	107	$ 8,299.98
Unscheduled report generation	40	$ 3,049.79
Total	581	$41,788.31

[a]Note costs figures do not include computer time.

[b]New software was developed for the Annual Statistical Report, the Child Find Report, and for data base improvements.

[c]Special projects included the class scheduling process and the development of an enrollment projections system.

11. It is difficult to assess the magnitude of the dollar value of almost $42,000 for the 78-79 special educaton data base (note the figure does not include cost in terms of computer time) without having assigned dollar costs to the benefits realized from the data base. If benefits equal or outweigh immediate data base costs, the immediate cost of almost $42,000 may be cheap. On the other hand, it could be expensive, but the cost analysis study reported previously suggests that the computer application is much more cost effective.

    One isolated bit of cost-benefit information came out of one end-of-year ad hoc request for detailed transportation data. The cost of providing the data was about 800 dollars (in terms of professional salary), but the request to the state for transportation reimbursement to the District involved about $600,000 dollars. A manual response to the information request

would easily have entailed a cost of two thousand dollars in data collection and possibly critical delay in responding to the state.

12. While the current data base represents a significant contribution to managerial needs of special education, additional computer applications have been planned for development in the 1979-80 year. This will involve on-line computer access to aid in the monitoring of students in the special education appraisal process, and an inquiry system for immediate retrieval of student information. Such features will greatly improve user efficiency of the data base.

Additional Information:

Macy, D. J., Reisman, K. C., Holt, M.A., and Kocsis, J. J. Special Education Data Base (Tech. Rep. SP78-106-31-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, July, 1978.

Macy, D. J., Reisman, K. C., and Holt, M. A. Special Education Data (Tech. Rep. SE77-106-3-8). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, July, 1977.

Carter, J. L., Carpenter, D. F., and Macy, D. J. Special Education Data Base (Res. Rep. 76-890). Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, June, 1976.

Googles

Special Education Data Base

1. Rosters of special education students were printed routinely every six weeks.

2. Management made 90 ad hoc requests for data base information and rosters.

3. Computer generation of the annual statistical report to the state was more cost effective than manual production.

4. Computer terminals were planned for use in special education subdistrict offices during 1979-80.

Reference:

Reisman, K. C., Holt, M. A., Kocsis, J. J., and Macy, D. J. Special Education Data Base, Research Report Nol SP79-415-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

SPECIAL EDUCATION CONTEXT EVALUATION

SP79-413-31-08

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and
Development

Dallas, Texas
August, 1979

Executive Summary

Special Education Context Evaluation

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy

Approved: _____

_____

Question 1: How many students were served in special education?

10,238 This was 7.70 percent of the total District enrollment.

Question 2: How did the number of students served compare to previous years and to national estimates of incidence?

A substantial increase over the three previous years. While there is no statistically sound basis for determining if the District is serving the expected number of students, P.L. 94-142 cites a 12 percent incidence rate, but survey data from large city schools indicate an average incidence rate of about seven percent. It is unclear whether or not the District is providing services to all students in need of special service.

Question 3: What was the profile of the total special education population in terms of grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap?

About 60 percent was in the elementary school level (in terms of chronological age), and about 60 percent was male. Ethnic percents were 40% Anglo, 46% Black, and 13% Hispanic. The most predominant handicaps were speech, retardation, and learning disability.

Question 4: How did the percents of ethnic representation in special education compare to total District ethnic percents?

They were comparable. Minority students tended to be underrepresented in special education. The same was true during the two previous years.

	1978-79 Ethnic Percents		
	White	Black	Hispanic
Total District	33.3	49.2	16.4
Special Education	39.9	46.2	13.2

Question 5: What were the instructional arrangements of students?

The resource room was the most predominant with about one-third of special students (excluding speech students) receiving regular classroom instruction for more than 50 percent of the day.

Question 6: How many students were dismissed?

About 18 percent of the total special education population (N = 1,802). The percent dismissed over the past three years was as follows:

76-77	77-78	78-79
21.6	15.7	17.6

Abstract

Special Education Context Evaluation

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: The District special education program attempts to provide appropriate education for every exceptional child. Special education makes use of a continuum of instructional arrangements which range from complete regular classroom instruction to total self-contained instruction in a special campus setting. The program attempts to provide individualized instruction for each student.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation conducted was a limited context evaluation of the implementation and operation of the special education program. As such, the evaluation yielded only basic information about program operation. Limited comparisons were made with results from previous years.

Sample: The sample included the total student population served in special education.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation used a very simple one-shot observational design, and the time of data collection was June 30, 1978. The data source was the special education computerized data base which is maintained by special education staff and research and evaluation personnel.

The evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

1. How many students were served in special education?
2. How did the number of students served compare to previous years and to national estimates of incidence?
3. What was the profile of the total special education population in terms of grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap?
4. How did the percents of ethnic representation in special education compare to total District ethnic percents?
5. What were the instructional arrangements of students served?
6. How many students were dismissed?

Evaluation Results:

1. Special education served a total of 10,238 students during the 1978-79 year. This was 7.70 percent of the total District student population. The number and percent served during the past four years were as follows:

	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
%	5.67	5.78	6.84	7.70
N	8,250	8,051	9,244	10,238

The program served almost 2,000 more students in 1978-79 than four years ago.

Interpretation of the upward trend in percent served across the four years must consider the decreasing total District enrollment over the same period, which inflated the percent served figures. When the current special enrollment was compared to the 1975-77 total District enrollment, the percent served was 7.05, rather than 7.70.

Since the legitimacy of national incidence rates is questionable, there is no sound statistical basis for determining if the District is serving the expected number of children. While P.L. 94-142 cites a 12 percent incidence rate, survey data from large city schools indicate an average incidence rate of about seven percent.

2. The percent of total students served in special education for subdistricts varied from 9.4 percent in the Southeast subdistrict to 4.8 percent in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict. The percent served was about 7.0 in the remaining three subdistricts.

A similar pattern among subdistricts was evident last year when the percent served ranged from 8.0 in the Southeast subdistrict to 4.0 in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict. The changes in the percent served from 77-78 to 78-79 did not indicate increased differences among subdistricts in terms of percent served. Almost all the change was due to decreasing enrollments in total subdistrict population. When percent served was based on the 77-78 total subdistrict enrollment, the percent served in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict was 4.7 and the percent in the Southeast subdistrict was 8.9. This difference of 4.2 percent was almost the same as the 4.0 difference during the 77-78 year.

Nevertheless, the percent served in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict was less than in other subdistricts. If one assumes that the incidence of handicaps is the same in all subdistricts (7.0 percent), then one would expect there to be about 586 handicapped children in

the East Oak Cliff subdistrict who were not served in the special education program during the last year. The extent to which any such children received an appropriate education program is not known, although the East Oak Cliff subdistrict reportedly offers alternative programs not available in other subdistricts.

3. Most District students were eligible for special education by reason of speech handicap, mental retardation, or learning disability. About 60 percent of special student population was in the elementary school level, and about 60 percent was male. These results were consistent with previous years.

4. Analysis of racial composition of the special education population revealed that ethnic representation was comparable to total District representation. This finding was consistent with the previous two years. Table 1 shows these comparisons across the past three years.

Table 1

Enrollment Racial Percentages in the Total District and Special Education over a Three-Year Period

		76-77	77-78	78-79
White	Total District	37.6	35.5	33.3
	Special Education	43.4	41.6	39.9
Black	Total District	46.9	48.2	49.2
	Special Education	44.8	45.3	46.2
Hispanic	Total District	14.3	15.2	16.4
	Special Education	11.3	12.4	13.2
Other	Total District	1.2	1.1	1.0
	Special Education	0.5	0.7	0.8

The above data are particularly noteworthy in that the District has been under court desegregation order for the past several years. A common experience accompanying such court orders in other urban school districts has been the disproportionate enrollment of racial miniorities in special education programs, presumably to maintain racial segregation.

One should note that Table 1 shows a tendency toward overrepresentation of White students and an underrepresentation of minority students in special education.

5. The resource room was the most frequently used instructional arrangement, and about one-third of the special students (excluding speech students) attended a regular classroom for more than 50 percent of the day. When speech students were counted, about one-half the special students attended a regular classroom for more than 50 percent of the day. About 18 percent of the students was dismissed from special education.

   The percent dismissed over the past three years was as follows:

	76-77	77-78	78-79
%	21.6	15.7	17.6

   The down and up trend over the past two years was likely due to increased enrollment, since one would not expect newly enrolled students to be dismissed at the same rate as other students. Another possible explanation also may have been recent changes in state eligibility guidelines regarding learning disabilities and minimal brain injury.

Googles

Special Education Context Evaluation

1. The District served a total of 10,238 handicapped students.

2. The number of special students served was 7.7 percent of the total District.

3. About 1/2 all special students attended a regular classroom for more than 1/2 the school day.

4. Ethnic composition of the special education population was very close to that of the District population.

Reference:

Macy, D. J. Special Education Context Evaluation, Research Report No. SP79-413-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE 1978-79 CHILD FIND PROJECT

SP79-417-31-08

Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam, M.A.
Jenci J. Kocsis, M.S.
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator-
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
June, 1979

Executive Summary

1978-79 Evaluation of Dallas Child Find

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hale

Question 1: Who were the agents making referrals to the child find office?

The majority of the referrals were a result of calls from parents, DISD school personnel and various community agencies.

Question 2: What demographic information described the referral population?

About 90 percent of the 187 referrals received were from the target population of out of school and unserved, handicapped children. Gender and ethnic proportions in the located population were as expected. Over 90 percent of the referrals were children at or below the elementary school level, with all children having moderate to severe handicapping conditions.

Question 3: What time lines were noted in procuring services for the target population?

Placement was established for approximately 43 percent of the children referred. The remaining 57 percent were still in process as of May 31. Those children placed waited an average of 15 weeks from the time of referral to placement.

Project management has procured additional appraisal resources in order to meet the needs associated with child find referrals. Additionally, management studied a selected sample of child find referrals in order to identify problem areas in the organization and operation of the appraisal/placement process.

Abstract

Dallas Child Find

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: During its fourth year, the project became an ongoing integral part of the Dallas Independent School District system. The project sought to continue its efforts toward refining a model system for locating out of school and unserved handicapped children in a large urban setting, and the monitoring of these children from identification through placement. However, project staff were reduced by fifty percent this year since the project had completed its developmental phase and is now integrated into normal District operating procedures and being supported by local funds.

Project activity during the fourth-year placed its greatest emphasis on the child find effort itself and the provision of services to the located population. Other activities conducted during previous years of implementation such as agency visitations, house-to-house canvassing, and so forth, were eliminated.

Fourth-year seek and find activities continued the utilization of the project's 24-hour telephone answering service as well as the use of a central administrative screening committee to achieve efficient routing of project referrals. Project staff continued its contact with various human service agencies throughout the metroplex through the dissemination of printed materials to the agencies. The project further continued the development and maintenance of its computerized information system at the local level for the storage and retrieval of information on children located, monitoring of the placement process and for long range planning.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation of child find sought to provide year-end follow-ups on referrals received, and to assess its efforts in locating the unserved, handicapped population and its success in the continued development of referral procedures.

Sample: The sample included the population of children who were referred to the Dallas child find office during the period of July 1, 1978 through May 31, 1979. The sample was composed of 187 children referred to the project during that time period.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design utilized for the study was the "One Shot Case Study" design. The following scheme represents the design utilized.

child find referrals ___ X O_1 ___ (N=187)

Data are a result of information obtained by project staff on the Project Zero Reject Intake Worksheet at the time of referral to the child find office. The data are further a result of information obtained through the project's computerized information system on the children referred.

The evaluation results are centered around child identification methodologies, referral demographic data, and the procurement of services (placement) for the located population. Comparisons of general trends noted on selected aspects of the project during its first - three years and the current year are also reported.

The project sought to answer the following major evaluation questions:

1. Who were the agents making referrals to the child find office?
2. What demographic information described the referral population?
3. What time lines were noted in procuring services for the target population?

Evaluation Results:

Child Find Strategies

1. This year the child find office reportedly averaged an estimate of 40-50 telephone calls per day or 800-1,000 calls per month. Last year (1977-78), project staff reported an estimated average of 10 calls per day or 200 calls per month. The previous year (1976-77), the project reportedly logged an estimated average of 18 telephone calls per day or 360 calls per month. During the first year (1975-76), the project logged a total of 345 calls from the latter part of January through June. The fact that two of the child find appraisal teams received their calls through the child find office attributed significantly to the number of calls reported this year. Project staff reported a significant decrease in the number of calls this year resulting from persons seeking general information about the child find program as compared to

previous years. However, the data show that the project's 24-hour telephone system continues to be a widely utilized vehicle for initiating child find referrals as the project received a total of 187 referrals from July 1, 1978 through May 31, 1979.

2. The major referral agents noted this year were parents, DISD school personnel and various community agencies, all of which accounted for more than 80 percent of the 187 referrals received this school year. Last year (1977-78), referrals from parents, DISD school personnel and agencies accounted for more than 90 percent of the 254 referrals received. These same three sources accounted for some 75 percent of the referrals received during the project's first and second year as well. The data show that these three sources (parents, DISD personnel and agencies), have consistently been the major referral agents throughtout the four-year span of the project.

Table 1

Tabulation of Child Find Referral Sources

Referral Source		N	Percent
Parents		62	33.2
Other family members		4	2.1
DISD school personnel		37	19.8
Physician		1	.5
Agencies		53	28.3
Public health nurse	18	9.6	
Community clinic	13	7.0	
MHMR centers	11	5.9	
Public welfare caseworker	11	5.9	
Hospital		13	7.0
Day care center		4	2.1
Region X		11	5.9
Other		11	5.9
Total N =		187	100.0

3. Various community agencies throughout the Metroplex have been instrumental in providing the child find telephone number to nearly 45 percent of the referents. DISD school personnel were cited as sources for the child find number by nearly 26 percent of the referents. DISD and agency personnel continue to be the two major sources for obtaining the child find telephone number, as these two sources alone have accounted for an average of 79 percent of the indirect referrals to the project for the past three years.

Referral Demography

4. Approximately 90 percent of the 187 referrals received this year were from the targeted population of out of school and unserved, handicapped children. Last year (excluding the MHMR referrals), approximately 94 percent of the referrals were from the target population. About 83 percent of the referrals received during the project's first and second year were from the target population. The data show that the project has been markedly consistent from one year to the next, in locating its intended population.

5. Data in terms of the age distribution of the 187 referrals received this year are markedly consistent with data obtained in this area during previous years of the project. On the average, over three-fourths of the referrals received each year have been children at or below the elementary school level, with over one-half of the children being between three and five years of age.

6. The gender and ethnicity percentages within the located population reflected the expected proportions. The male population has consistently appeared to be overrepresented throughout the duration of the project, but the observed proportion of males has been consistent with typical male incidence figures in special education programs. Referral ethnic proportions throughout the four years of the project have shown a close degree of consistency with District ethnic percentages except during the previous year (1977-78), where disproportionalities resulted from the overconcentration of Blacks within the MHMR referral population.

7. Of the 81 referrals that had their placement determined as of May 31, almost all were children with moderate to severe handicapping problems. The most frequently reported handicap this year was that of language/learning disability. During the past three years of the project, the area of mental retardation (primarily trainable) was the most frequently re-

reported handicap. The area of mental retardation (primarily educable) was the second most frequently reported handicap this year.

Procurement of Services

8. Placement was established for approximately 43 percent of the 187 children referred. Last year about 40 percent of the population referred were placed. During the first and second year of the project, placement was established for approximately 38 percent and 58 percent of the children referred, respectively. As of May 31, the remaining referrals had either been deferred or remained in the appraisal process.

Table 2

Tabulation of Referral Placement Decisions

Placement Decision	N	Percent
Placed	81	43.3
Speech	3	3.7
Regional deaf	1	1.2
DISD Special Education	49	60.5
Blind	1	1.2
Project KIDS	2	2.5
Contract	1	1.2
Private school	2	2.5
Moved (before placement)	3	3.7
Refused service	9	11.1
Inelibile	6	7.4
Other	4	5.0
In Process	106	56.7
Total	187	100.0

9. Those children who were placed waited an average of 15 weeks from the time of referral to placement. Last year the average amount of time from referral to placement was 13 weeks. During the first and second year of the project, the average amount of time from referral to placement was 8.1 weeks and 10 weeks, respectively. The data tend to indicate an increase in the average amount of time from referral to placement from one year to the next. However, one should consider the number of referrals received each successive year with 88, 226, 254 (160 excluding MHMR referrals) and 187 children referred, respectively each year.

10. For those incomplete cases, the average time for case reviews was 2.7 weeks while the average amount of time between case reviews and May 31, was 6.3 weeks. Data obtained in this area tend to vary from one year to the next.

The following table provides a summary of general trends noted on selected aspects of child find referral data. The information has been previously discussed in the body of the report, but this table provides for greater synthesis of the data, as well as for ease of comparison over the four years of implementation. Note that all third-year data (1977-78) exclude the 94 MHMR referrals that resulted from the closing of one of their facilities. The data represent only the major findings within each category.

Table 3

Child Find Four-Year Trends

Year	No. Referrals Received	Major Referral Sources (Percent)	Percent Placed	Percent From Target Population[a]	Percent Pre-school
1975-76 (Jan. to June 30)	106	Parents (41.5) DISD (7.5) Agencies (34.1)	37.5 (N=33)	83.0 (N=88)	0-2→11.4 3-5→31.8
1976-77 (July 1- June 30)	226	Parents (25.3) DISD (13.7) Agencies (36.3)	57.5 (N=130)	82.7 (N=187)	0-2→ 4.9 3-5→51.3
1977-78 (July 1 - June 30)	160 (254 including 94 MHMR referrals)	Parents (36.9) DISD (19.5) Agencies (32.6)	63.8 (N=102)	93.7 (N=150)	0-2→ 3.1 3-5→73.1
1978-79 (July 1 - May 30)	187	Parents (33.2) DISD (19.8) Agencies (28.3)	43.3 (N=81)	90.4 (N=169)	0-2→24.6 3-5→56.2

[a]Out of school, unserved handicapped

The results of the study indicated a possible need to study the appraisal/placement process in terms of child find referrals. Accordingly, project management reviewed a selected sample (N=12) of referrals case by case in order to identify slow downs and problem areas in the process. Additionally, project management committed increased appraisal resources to child find referrals during the summer in order to eliminate further delays in appraisal/placement.

Googles

Child Find

1. Almost all of the 167 referrals were from the target population of unserved and handicapped.

2. Over 90 percent of referrals were at or below the elementary school level.

3. Children waited about 16 weeks from referral to placement in school.

Reference:

Gilliam, D. F. C., Kocsis, J. J., and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of the 1978-79 Child Find Project, Research Report No. SP79-417-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent SChool District, June, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF PROJECT KIDS 1978-79

SP79-416-31-08

Jamie L. Carter, M.S.
and
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and
Development

Dallas, Texas
September, 1979

Executive Summary

Evaluation of Project KIDS 1978-79
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Jamie L. Carter
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: How many children were served in Project KIDS?

148 (44 home-based, 17 center-based, 87 school-based) Overall, 380 children received instruction through the Project KIDS model during the 1978-79 school year due to the expansion of a KIDS Outreach program. In addition to the 148 children served in the original Project KIDS program, 232 children were served in the Outreach program, which included 190 students within the DISD and 42 students in three regional school districts.

Question 2: What demographic characteristics described the population of children and their parents?

Children: 61 percent male, 47 percent Black, 41 percent White, 11 percent Hispanic and one percent other. Age range was two months to six years. Predominant handicaps were due to developmental delay, learning/language disability, Down's Snydrome, cerebral palsy and varied abnormalities.

Parents: Educational level ranged from elementary school to college graduates. About 50 percent of the families owned their homes which ranged in value from $8,000 to $300,000.

Question 3: What was the observed improvement, if any, in the areas of developmental delay?

Project KIDS students made some significant improvement in the areas of delay as measured by pre-post scores on a developmental scale and two standardized tests.

Developmental scale scores, as determined by the number of tasks successfully completed by the students on the KIDS Inventory of Development, increased significantly in all four areas of the inventory: gross motor, fine

motor, cognitive/language and self-care. Average gains of younger children (ages 0-2 years) during a 12-month interval were 5.5 months (mental scale) and 6.4 months (motor scale) on the Bayley Scales of Infant Development. Of the school-based children (ages 3-5 years) who scored within the norms on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities, the average gain was 8.1 months during a seven-month interval. (About 60 percent of the McCarthy sample scored below the norms.)

Question 4: What were the needs reported by parents in a self-appraisal inventory?

Can set goals for the child which are realistic for the child's abilities.

Can set rules and limits for the child's behavior and consistently enforce them.

Can use everyday activities as learning opportunities for the child.

Can make plans for the future of the child.

Question 5: What preferences did parents exhibit in selecting activities for their individualized training programs?

According to selections by parents, the most popular categories of activities were reading books and performing other individual tasks. However, these activities were also the categories most often offered through the Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory. By comparing the percentages of selected activities to the percentages of offered activities, parents seemed to prefer activities involving books, filmstrips and consultations by selecting more activities than would have been expected.

Subject areas most frequently selected by parents concerned: language acquisition; the parent as a teacher; behavior management; and self-care.

Question 6: What was the reaction of parents to the project?

Results of the parent reaction survey indicated that parents held highly favorable attitudes toward the Project KIDS program, especially in the areas of staff qualifications, student progress and parent involvement.

Abstract

Evaluation of Project KIDS 1978-79
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Jamie L. Carter
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: Project KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems) is a Dallas Independent District model program for handicapped infants, toddlers, preschool children and their families. The early intervention project serves developmentally delayed and physically handicapped children from 0-60 months of age, with services delivered through three methods: a home-based training program, center-based infant stimulation classes and school-based early childhood units. Project KIDS attempts to integrate the child's parents into the instructional role in cooperation with project staff. The administration and organization of the project is built around five components: children, parents, staff development, demonstration/dissemination and evaluation. Beginning with the 1978-79 school year, the project received a second federal grant which supported a Project KIDS Outreach program. The purpose of the Outreach project is to increase the number of quality programs for young handicapped children through replication of an established project model.

The major objectives are:

1. to improve development or function of children in the identified area or areas of delay.

2. to provide a continuum of education from a home setting to a school setting for handicapped children and their parents.

3. to deliver cooperative instructional service efforts through project staff and parents by using home visits, infant stimulation classes or public school early childhood classes.

4. to develop and utilize a parent self-appraisal inventory as a means of identifying parent needs in the area of parenting handicapped children in terms of the cognitive and affective domains.

5. to develop and implement cooperative plans for individual parent training activities as the primary vehicle for improving needs identified in the self-appraisal inventory.

6. to develop and utilize a staff survey instrument as baseline curriculum document where competencies and skills are interfaced with survey items.

7. to distribute information packages on key dissemination products and conduct demonstration activities.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation sought to provide a comprehensive study of project implementation and effectiveness, with emphasis in the areas of student progress and the parenting program. As such, the evaluation specified process and product evaluation questions within the components of the project.

Sample: The samples selected for data collection included about 40 to 100 percent of the respective populations. The numbers of children served in the three instructional arrangements were:

Setting	Population size
Home-based	44
Center-based	17
School based	87
Total	148

These numbers did not include the 232 children served in the Project KIDS Outreach program.

Evaluation Design: The study was primarily cross-sectional, but did include some pre-post observations. The following schematics give the design of the study for each major group observed. In the schematics, X represents the application of a treatment (i.e., home-based instruction, parent training, etc.), and O represents observations (i.e., data collection).

Children $O_1 _ X _ O_2$ (N = 115, developmental progress)

The above schematic shows that there were pre-post observation for children on the developmental measures (Bayley Scales, N = 12; McCarthy Scales, N = 25; and KIDS Inventory of Development, N = 78).

Parents $_ _ O_1 _ X$ (N = 92, parent needs, preferences)

$_ _ X _ O_1$ (N = 44, parent reactions)

The above schematic describes two types of designs utilized in the parent component. Data on parent needs and training preferences were collected at the beginning of the school year with subsequent treatment based on parent responses. Parent reaction data were collected at the end of the school year after parents had participated in the program.

Other data regarding demographic characteristics were collected from project records as needed throughout the year.

The evaluation was designed to answer the following major questions:

Student and Parent Demography

1. How many children were served in Project KIDS?

2. What demographic characteristics described the population of children and their parents?

Student Progress

3. What was the observed improvement, if any, in the areas of developmental delay?

Parent Needs, Reactions and Preferences

4. What were the needs reported by parents in a self-appraisal inventory?

5. What preferences did parents exhibit in selecting activities for their individualized training programs?

6. What was the reaction of parents to the project?

Evaluation Results:

Student and Parent Demography

1. Project KIDS provided instructional services to 148 handicapped infants and preschool children during the 1978-79 year. This was an increase of 20 over the previous year. (This total did not include the Outreach sites.)

2. By instructional setting, 44 children received instruction in their homes; 17 students attended center-based infant stimulation classes; and 87 students attended eight school-based early childhood classes in six DISD schools.

3. By sex, 91 (61.5 percent) of the children were males, and 57 (38.5 percent) were females.

4. According to ethnicity, the largest proportion of children served was Black. The ethnic composition of Project KIDS was: 70 (47.3 percent) Black; 61 (41.2 percent) White; 16 (10.8 percent) Hispanic; and one (0.7 percent) other.

5. Project KIDS served children zero through six years of age. The frequencies of children by age were: eight children under one year of age; 24 one-year-old children; 28 two-year-old children; 23 three-year-old children; 26 four-year-old children; 34 five-year-old children; and five six-year-old children.

6. Not accounting for the overlap of continuing students, Project KIDS served 382 children during its four years of operation. When considering the students who were served for more than one year, 263 individual students were served.

7. Project KIDS Outreach expanded the program to include all early childhood classrooms within the DISD's special education program. This outreach expansion included the implementation of the Project KIDS model in 21 classrooms in 17 schools in addition to the home program, center program and original eight school-based classrooms. Also, three regional school districts began implementation of the Project KIDS model through the Outreach program. (see Report No. SP79-419-31-01).

8. Overall, 380 children received instruction through the Project KIDS model during the 1978-79 school year. In addition to the 148 children served in the Project KIDS program, 232 children were served in the Project KIDS Outreach programs. The Outreach programs included 190 students within the DISD and 42 students in three regional school districts.

9. All but 34 of the 148 Project KIDS students were still actively enrolled in the program at the end of the school year. Of these students, two children were dismissed from the program after progressing to a level consistent with their chronological age and were staffed into regular kindergarten classes.

10. In conjunction with the objective of providing a continuum of education for handicapped children from the home to the public school setting, five children were promoted from the home program to the center-based infant stimulation classes. Also, 19 center-based students were scheduled to be promoted to the school-based program for the 1979-80 school year.

11. Project KIDS served a heterogeneous group of students by handicapping condition. In the home and center programs, most of the children were multiply handicapped with the primary handicapping conditions most often diagnosed as developmental delay, Down's Syndrome and cerebral palsy. The most frequent primary handicapping condition in the school-based program was learning/language disabled, followed by educable mentally retarded, minimal brain injured and trainable mentally retarded.

12. In the home and center program, most of the children (N = 38, 62.3 percent) were living with both parents. Fifteen children (24.6 percent) were living in a single parent household. The remaining children were living in foster homes, with grandparents or legal guardians.

13. Parents in the home and center program represented diversified socioeconomic levels. About 50 percent of the families owned their homes which ranged in estimated value from $8,000 to

$300,000. The median value of the homes was $30,000. Most of the parents had graduated from high school, and several parents had received college and advanced degrees. About 28 percent of the parents received less than a high school education. By occupation, the highest percentage of parents (41.3 percent) was employed in typically "blue collar" occupations, followed by not employed (29.8 percent), "white collar" occupations (26.0 percent) and unknown (2.9 percent).

Student Progress

14. Project KIDS students made some significant improvement in areas of developmental delay during the 1978-79 year as measured by a developmental scale and two standardized tests. Along with a survey of parental judgments of student progress, results from the three evaluation methods provided concurrent evidence to support the conclusion that students had made progress.

15. For the younger children in the home and center programs (ages 0-30 months), raw scores (N = 12) on the Bayley Mental Scale significantly increased from pretest to posttest (12-month interval). The average gain in months on the Mental Scale was 5.5, with a range from 0.5 to 13.1 months. Pretest-posttest comparisons on the Bayley Motor Scale were not statistically significant, but this lack of significance might have been due to a small sample size (N = 11). The average gain on the Motor Scale was 6.4 months, with a range from -0.3 to 14.3 months.

16. For randomly-sampled children (N = 25) in the school-based early childhood classes, raw scores on the McCarthy Scales general cognitive subtest significantly increased from pretest to posttest (seven-month interval). With the use of repeated-measures analysis of variance, the results were significant at the .01 level. Results were not significant on the McCarthy motor subtest with a sample size of 20.

17. When the McCarthy general cognitive scores were transformed to scale scores, 15 students (60 percent) scored below the norms on the pretest and/or the posttest, indicating the severity of handicapping conditions. Based on a normal population, only one-tenth of one percent of all students taking the McCarthy would be expected to score below the norms. Scores of these 15 students were over three standard deviations below the mean.

18. Of the 10 students scoring within the norms, three children made sufficient gains to place their scores at or near a level appropriate to their chronological age on the McCarthy general cognitive subtest. These 10 students made an average of 8.1 months gain during the seven-month interval, with a range from one month to 19 months.

19. Significant gains were made by the children (N = 78) from pretest to posttest on the KIDS Inventory of Development Scale, a developmental checklist developed by the Project KIDS staff. Scores, as determined by the number of developmental tasks successfully completed by the students, increased significantly in all four areas of the inventory: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive/language and self-care.

20. The average gains in raw scores (numbers of developmental tasks mastered) from pretest to posttest on the KIDS Inventory were: gross motor, 4.8; fine motor, 6.5; cognitive/language, 12.8; and self-care, 6.4.

21. The statistical phenomenon of "regression to the mean" was considered in the analysis of data since Project KIDS served a population exhibiting extreme low scores due to developmental delays. To control for "regression to the mean," pretest scores of the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities were transformed to predicted or "regressed" scores through a weighting process which, in this case, increased the pretest scores. These procedures decreased the likelihood of statistically significant results. Even after controlling for "regression to the mean," many of the results were still statistically significant, thus allowing for increased confidence in the interpretation that students had exhibited progress in some areas of developmental delay.

22. In a survey of parental judgments concerning student progress, parents responded that they felt their children had made progress while in the Project KIDS program.

23. In an effort to increase techniques for measuring progress in young handicapped children, a videotaping program was designed and implemented. A step-by-step videotaping protocol was written and then utilized in the filming of nine students in the Project KIDS program. Although specifically designed to provide visual and auditory documentation of progress to supplement numerical test scores, the videotaping program was also targeted for uses such as educational planning, case or longitudinal studies, parent involvement/training, staff training and demonstration/dissemination.

Parent Needs, Preferences and Reactions

24. On a self-appraisal inventory, parents rated their overall competence level at average or above for those areas investigated in the study.

25. In self-assessed ratings, parents identified their needs and strengths in the following areas:

Needs	Strengths
Can set goals for the child which are realistic for the child's abilities.	Can provide good health care including a balanced diet, home safety, cleanliness and medical attention.
Can set rules and limits for the child's behavior and consistently enforce them.	Can accept the child as a unique and valuable. individual.
Can use everyday activities as learning opportunities for the child.	Can give the child a stable home life.
Can make plans for the future of the child.	

26. There was high agreement between parents of the younger children (ages 0-2 years) and parents of the older children (ages 3-6 years) in the identification of needs and strengths, according to responses on the 14-item self-appraisal inventory. However, areas of discrepancy were in child management, a need emphasized by parents of older children, and planning for the future, a need emphasized by parents of the younger children.

27. Parent responses were used to design individualized training programs for the parents, who selected activities according to their identified needs. In the selection of activities, the most popular categories of activities were reading books and performing other individual tasks. However, these activities were also the categories most often offered through the Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory. By comparing the percentages of selected activities to the percentages of offered activities, parents seemed to prefer activities involving books, filmstrips and consultations by selecting more activities than would have been expected.

28. Parents of the younger children and older children showed similar preferences in selecting activities, except that parents of the younger children chose more activities involving books and less activities involving groups than would have been expected.

29. As reflected by preferred activities, subject areas most frequently selected by parents concerned: language acquisition; the parent as a teacher; behavior management; self-care; and videotapes of own child. Slight age-related differences were noted, with parents of the older children emphasizing behavior management activities and parents of younger children emphasizing self-care. Both groups of parents stressed activities concerning language acquisition and the parent as a teacher.

30. Results of the parent reaction survey indicated that parents held highly favorable attitudes toward the Project KIDS program.

31. Parents emphasized their confidence in the qualifications of the Project KIDS staff. In both scaled and open-ended questions, parents expressed confidence in the expertise and attitudes of the staff.

32. Parents said they were "happy" with the program and wanted to continue their involvement. Results from the parent survey were consistent with results from the previous two years.

33. Parents were enthusiastic about the parent training program and stated that they would like to continue and expand the activities, according to a telephone interview with parents who had been involved in the program for three years (N=15).

Additional Information:

Macy, D. J. Project KIDS Theoretical Control Group Study (Tech. Rep. SP78-110-81-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, October, 1978.

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS (Tech. Rep. SP78-105-31-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, September, 1978.

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS (Tech. Rep. SE77-064-3-8). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, August, 1977.

Googles

Project KIDS and KIDS Outreach

1. The number of children served by KIDS expanded greatly - to a total of 380 preschool handicapped children.

2. Parents reacted very favorably to the project and to parent training activities.

3. Parents selected language acquisition, parent as a teacher, behavior management, and self-care as the most popular subject areas for parent training.

4. Classroom teachers reacted favorably to the technical assistance provided by KIDS staff.

5. Children improved significantly in developmental progress, but the impact of the KIDS model was likely less dramatic than in previous years.

6. A total of 247 dissemination packages was sold (at cost) to agencies and personnel in 24 states.

References:

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS 1978-79, Research Report No. SP79-416-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Gilliam, D. F. C. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS Outreach, Research Report No. SP79-419-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Rogers, A. M. Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study, Research Report No. SP79-412-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE 1978-79 PROJECT KIDS OUTREACH

SP79-419-31-08

Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam, M.A.
and
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Projects Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and
Development

Dallas, Texas
September, 1979

Executive Summary

Evaluation of Project KIDS Outreach
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: What characteristics described the replication sites?

Total campus enrollment of the 20 schools involved in Outreach ranged from 138 to 940 students, with the overall average enrollment being about 398 students per campus. All but four schools had one Outreach class per school. Four DISD schools had two classes implementing the program. The number of students served in Outreach per class ranged from 4 to 15 students with the average number served per class being about nine students. All but one Outreach class was staffed with one teacher and one teacher-aide either full or part-time.

Question 2: What demographic characteristics described the students served in the program?

Students served were about 61 percent male, 55 percent White, 30 percent Black and 15 percent Hispanic. The age range was two to nine years. The areas of mental retardation and language/learning disability were the predominant handicaps of students served across the program.

Question 3: Which components of the KIDS program did the Outreach sites select for replication?

The Outreach participants concentrated their service delivery efforts on the school-based early childhood population of three to five year olds. The support systems provided included an appraisal/curriculum component, staff development, parent involvement and a program evaluation component, with project staff providing technical assistance in each component area of replication.

Question 4: What was the instructional history of the Outreach students?

The MAPs (Mini Activity Plans) are the basic vehicle of instruction in the project and encompass cognitive/language, gross and fine motor and self-help activities. Students were assigned an average of 8.3 MAPs per area of delay with the number assigned across all areas ranging from 1 to 32. Overall, students completed about two-thirds of the 1,707 MAPs assigned. All students completed one or more MAPs across all areas with individual completion rates per area ranging from 0 to 100 percent. The analysis of completion rates based on the amount of time in the program showed a wide degree of variability. Overall individual mastery rates by area ranged from .20 to 6.0 MAPS completed per month. Computation of a point biserial correlation between mastery rate and time in the program revealed no significant relationship ($r = -.11$).

Question 5: How did the Outreach site participants view the technical assistance provided?

Reactions to technical assistance were favorable, but parent involvement was cited as a problem area.

Question 6: What was the reaction of the staff at the replication sites to the program?

Staff reactions to the overall program were generally positive and favorable.

Question 7: What was the reaction of the Outreach participants to staff development activities?

There was favorable positive participant reaction to staff development activities.

Question 8: What were the demonstration/dissemination activities of the project?

The project continued its dissemination of packages in the areas of staff development, appraisal, curriculum, parent involvement and evaluation. A total of 247 dissemination packages was sold (at cost) to agencies and personnel in 24 states. Other activities included site visits and presentations at professional conferences.

Abstract

Project KIDS Outreach
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: Project KIDS Outreach is a first-year program designed to increase the number of quality programs for young handicapped children through replication of the Project KIDS model training activities, demonstration and dissemination activities. Project KIDS is a DISD model program for handicapped infants, toddlers, preschool children and their families. The program, which is financially supported by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U. S. Office of Education, is part of a nationwide network of early childhood projects for the handicapped. The three potential service delivery program settings include a home-based training program for infants (0 - 24 months), a center-based training program for toddlers (24 - 36 months) and a school-based early childhood program for pre-schoolers (36 - 60 months). The KIDS Outreach component concentrates its service delivery efforts on the school-based early childhood population (three to five year olds). The support systems provided to each setting include an appraisal/curriculum component, staff development, parent involvement and a program evaluation component.

The objectives of the project apply to several levels which include the following:

Local Level

(1) Replicate all or a portion of the program components of Project KIDS in a minimum of five additional sites in the Dallas Independent School District.

Regional Level

(2) Replicate all or a portion of the program components of Project KIDS in a minimum of three additional sites in the area served by the Region 10 Education Service Center.

(3) Conduct demonstration and information sharing activities to increase public awareness of the program model and of the importance of early intervention.

State Level

(4) Participate in the Triple T Consortium (Teaching Texas Tots), a statewide organization for projects who serve handicapped infants, to promote and encourage permissive legislation for handicapped infants zero to three years of age.

National Level

(5) Distribute Project KIDS dissemination packages in appraisal, curriculum, staff development, evaluation and parent involvement to other early childhood programs, public and private schools, and regional service centers to facilitate the development of quality programs.

Participation in KIDS Outreach by regional school districts was decided by local school option. The Education Service Center, Region X advised regional districts of the availability of KIDS Outreach, and these districts opted to participate in Outreach in accordance with their needs.

Original project objectives and budget called for replication of the KIDS model components in a minimum of five sites in the Dallas ISD and a minimum of three districts in Region X. While the commitment to three regional sites was realized, KIDS Outreach implementation in the Dallas ISD included 21 sites in contrast to the minimum of five initially specified. Programmatic need and philosophy supported the expansive intradistrict implementation of Outreach, but such implementation did decrease resources available per site and increased implementation difficulties.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation sought to monitor the implementation process and to provide a comprehensive study of project implementation and effectiveness within the component areas of replication.

Sample: The student sample included the population of students served in local and regional Outreach during the 1978-79 school year. The population consisted of 232 students.

The teacher sample was composed of the 24 teachers (21 local, 3 regional) involved in the KIDS Outreach program during its first year.

The regional program personnel sample included two regional special education program directors, one diagnostician and one counselor that participated in first-year Outreach activities.

Random samples from the student and teacher populations were utilized in selected studies within the evaluation.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation was primarily cross-sectional in nature The following schemata represent the designs utilized for each study. In the schemata, X represents the application of a treatment (i.e., school-based instruction, model implementation, etc.), and O represents observations (i.e., data collection).

Students: $_\ X\ _\ O_1\ _$ (N=53, instructional history)

The above scheme shows that instructional history data were collected on 53 students near the end of the school year. The data were obtained through a mail-out questionnaire.

Teachers: $X\ _\ O_1\ _\ X\ _\ O_2$ (O_1: N=13 mid-year, O_2: N=24 end-of-year, model implementation)

$_\ X\ _\ O_1\ _$ (N=24, project reaction)

The above schemata show that the model implementation study was conducted near mid-year with a random sample of Outreach teachers and again near the end of the year with all Outreach teachers. Project reaction data were obtained near the end of the school year. Model implementation data were obtained via personal interviews, while reaction data were obtained through a mail-out questionnaire.

regional program personnel: $_\ X\ _\ O_1\ _$ (N=4, project reaction)

The above scheme shows that project reaction data were obtained from four regional program personnel near the end of the school year. The data were obtained through a mail-out questionnaire.

Other data regarding project implementation were obtained from project records as needed throughout the year.

The evaluation sought to answer the following major evaluation questions:

1. What characteristics described the replication sites?
2. What demographic characteristics described the students served in the program?
3. Which components of the KIDS program did the Outreach sites select for replication?
4. What was the instructional history of the Outreach students?
5. How did the Outreach site participants view the technical assistance provided?

6. What was the reaction of the staff at the replication sites to the program?

7. What was the reaction of the Outreach participants to staff development activities?

8. What were the demonstration/dissemination activities of the project?

Evaluation Results:

Replication Site Characteristics

1. The Project KIDS Outreach program was implemented in 21 classrooms (17 schools) within the Dallas ISD and four classrooms (three schools) within the Duncanville ISD, the Grand Prairie ISD and the Lancaster ISD during the 1978-79 school year. Evaluation results were reported in terms of 24 Outreach classrooms, as one classroom at the regional level that was added to the program later in the year, was not included in the evaluation process.

2. Replication site characteristic data showed that the total campus enrollment of the 20 schools involved in Outreach ranged from 138 to 940 students, with the overall average campus enrollment being about 398 students per campus. Of the 20 schools involved in the program, all but four had one Outreach class per school. Four schools in the DISD had two classes per school implementing the program. The number of students served in Outreach per class ranged from 4 to 15 students. The average number served per class was about nine students. All Outreach classes, except one, were staffed with one teacher and at least one teacher-aide either full or part-time.

3. The following provides a summary of teacher experience:

Experience (years)	Average	Range
total	4.9	1-20
special education	3.3	1-11
early childhood	2.1	1-5

4. Resources provided through the DISD included materials, technical assistance in model implementation, with some teachers also reporting having received services and assis-

tance from various support personnel such as occupational and physical therapists, psychologists, etc., and the use of libraries, and resource materials. Those resources provided through the Region 10 Education Service Center generally included various materials and equipment.

Student Demography

5. A total of 232 children were served in Outreach during its first year. The majority of the students, 190, were served in the DISD, with the remaining 42 students being served in the regional Outreach sites.

6. Students served in Outreach were about 61 percent (N=115) male and about 39 percent (N=75) female, with comparable proportions noted in both local and regional sites. The largest ethnic population served across all Outreach sites was White (54.7 percent). However, the proportion of Whites served in the regional Outreach sites was significantly greater than the proportion served in local Outreach (91 percent and 47 percent, respectively). The remainder of the population was composed of 30.2 percent Black and 15.1 percent Hispanic. The ages of the students served ranged from two to nine years. The largest number of students served were in the three to five year age group (81.5 percent).

7. All but 28 of the 232 students served during the year were actively enrolled in the Outreach program at the end of the school year. Those students who were inactive had either moved, transferred, were placed in other instructional settings, were dropped or withdrawn from the program, with one child being placed in a non-public school program.

8. The project served a heterogeneous group of students. The most frequently reported handicap of students served in local (DISD) Outreach and regional Outreach was that of mental retardation (educable and trainable) and speech, respectively. The areas of mental retardation and language/learning disability were the two most frequently reported handicaps of students served across the program.

Model Implementation

9. During its first year of implementation, 21 classrooms within the Dallas ISD and four classrooms within the Duncanville ISD, the Grand Prairie ISD and the Lancaster ISD were involved in the Project KIDS Outreach program. The Outreach participants concentrated their service delivery efforts on the school-based early childhood population of three to five year olds. The support systems provided included an appraisal/curriculum

component, staff development, parent involvement and a program evaluation component, with project staff providing technical assistance in each component area of replication.

10. The following provides a summary of the extent of program implementation on selected major aspects of the KIDS model components:

Model Components	Percent Implementing (N=24)
1) Administering KIDS Inventory of Development Scale to <u>all</u> students in program	83
a. Inventories current	92
2) Sending MAPs (Mini-Activity Plans) home for parents to assist in instruction	88
3) Charting student activities with the MAPs	75
4) Wall charts of student progress displayed	67
5) Individualized student folders	100
a. Currently assigned MAPs in folder	63
6) IEPs for each student	100
7) Learning centers in classroom	88
8) Implementing parent involvement	92

11. Implementation problem areas cited by teachers included difficulties in administering the Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory and difficulties in using the KIDS Inventory of Development Scale. Teachers reportedly lacked appropriate materials and equipment for the Inventory, and selected teachers questioned the applicability of the Inventory.

12. About one-half of the 24 Outreach teachers cited specific staff development needs in terms of assistance in behavior management training and socialization, charting, parent involvement, paperwork, more severely involved students and assistance in the use and administration of the KIDS Inventory.

13. The Outreach teachers most often cited the parent involvement component as being the area in which they would like to have more assistance during the next school year. A number of teachers also requested more assistance with charting student progress.

14. The programs' structure and sequencing of activities, parent involvement, the recording of student progress, early intervention, the Inventory in terms of noting student progress and its help in the writing of IEPs, increased resources and personnel, the fact that the program provided guidelines and a basis for instruction and the programs' consistency across all early childhood programs in the District were cited as major advantages of the KIDS Outreach program.

15. The Outreach teachers cited disadvantages of the program in terms of paperwork, the time consuming nature of the program, a lack of specific materials, parent involvement in terms of the teachers inability to stimulate interest and participation, the lack of practical activities and localized meetings, and the added teacher responsibility; the decrease in resources due to growth of the project and the fact that more assistance and training was not provided prior to initiation of the program.

Student Instructional History

16. Analysis of instructional data (N=53) showed that the category of cognitive/language was the students' greatest area of development delay, followed by fine motor and gross motor development. Self-help was the least frequent area of delay for students in the sample. Over two-thirds of the students had cognitive/language as their greatest area of delay.

17. Students were assigned an average of 8.3 MAPs per area of delay with the number assigned across all areas ranging from 1 to 32 MAPs assigned. The area of fine motor development had the highest completion rate (70.8 percent), while the area of gross motor development had the lowest completion rate (57.9 percent). Overall, students completed about two-thirds of the 1,707 MAPs assigned. All students completed one or more MAPs across all areas with individual completion rates per area ranging from 0 to 100 percent.

18. The analysis of completion rates based on the amount of time in the program showed a wide degree of variability. Overall individual mastery rates by area ranged from .20 to 6.0 MAPs completed per month. Computation of a point biserial correlation between mastery rate and time in the program revealed no significant relationship ($r = -.11$).

19. Demographic data showed that students sampled for instructional history were about 55 percent male (N=29) and 45 percent female (N=24). The ethnic composition was about 45 percent White, 38 percent Black and 17 percent Hispanic. The age of the students ranged from three to seven years with over one-half of the students being three to four years of age. The average age was 4.4 years.

Participant Reaction

20. The majority of the Outreach teachers indicated favorable reactions to technical assistance in model implementation provided by project staff. The teachers generally felt that the assistance they received was adequate, valuable and worthwhile and that they had acquired a better understanding of the Outreach program as a result.

21. Regional program personnel generally expressed positive reactions toward the technical assistance they received in the development of site-specific evaluation plans. The participants felt that their skills in this area had been improved and that they had acquired a better understanding of the role of evaluation in project implementation.

22. Overall reactions to staff development activities were generally positive as the majority of the program participants (both local and regional) indicated that staff development in Project KIDS had been valuable and helpful in their role as an Outreach participant and that they had benefitted from the information presented.

23. The most popular aspects of the program included staff development, technical assistance, project staff, University Affiliated Center student evaluations, parent involvement and the KIDS Inventory and MAPs. The least popular aspects of the program were centered around paperwork, charting and parenting.

24. Participant reactions to the overall program were generally favorable. Most participants felt that they had benefitted from the program and expressed a desire to continue in the Outreach program. Some regional program personnel also expressed a desire to extend the Outreach program to other classes in their area.

Demonstration/Dissemination

25. The project continued its dissemination of packages in the areas of staff development, appraisal, curriculum, parent involvement and evaluation. A total of 247 dissemination packages was sold (at cost) to agencies and personnel in 24 states. Other activities included site visits and presentations at professional conferences.

Additional Information:

Macy, D. J. Project KIDS Theoretical Control Group Study (Tech. Rep. SP78-110-81-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, October, 1978.

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS (Tech. Rep. SP78-105-31-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Rsearch, Evaluation, and Information Systems, September, 1978.

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS (Tech. Rep. SE77-064-3-8). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, August, 1977.

Googles

Project KIDS and KIDS Outreach

1. The number of children served by KIDS expanded greatly - to a total of 380 preschool handicapped children.

2. Parents reacted very favorably to the project and to parent training activities.

3. Parents selected language acquisition, parent as a teacher, behavior management, and self-care as the most popular subject areas for parent training.

4. Classroom teachers reacted favorably to the technical assistance provided by KIDS staff.

5. Children improved significantly in developmental progress, but the impact of the KIDS model was likely less dramatic than in previous years.

6. A total of 247 dissemination packages was sold (at cost) to agencies and personnel in 24 states.

References:

Carter, J. L. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS 1978-79, Research Report No. SP79-416-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Gilliam, D. F. C. and Macy, D. J. Evaluation of Project KIDS Outreach, Research Report No. SP79-419-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Rogers, A. M. Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study, Research Report No. SP79-412-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

SECOND LEVEL PROJECT KIDS THEORETICAL CONTROL STUDY

SP79-412-31-08

Alberta M. Rogers, M.Ed.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and
Development

Dallas, Texas
September, 1979

Executive Summary

Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical
Control Study

Evaluators: Alberta M. Rogers Approved: Robert P. Globe

Question 1: What was the reliability of scores projected by experts?

ACCEPTABLE

Reliability estimates were .90 or higher for four of the six scales included in the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and the KIDS on Inventory of Development.

Question 2: What was the validity of scores projected by experts?

GOOD

Comparison of Bayley scores projected independently by two panels of experts yielded correlation coefficients of .96 on the mental scale and .92 on the motor scale.

Question 3: Did individual experts exhibit any systematic variance in the magnitude of their score projections?

YES, FOR TWO OF FIVE EXPERTS

Of the five experts, one exhibited a consistent tendency in projecting higher scores (a psychologist) and the other was consistently lower (a nurse) than the other panelists. The remaining experts exhibited no systematic variation in projecting scores.

Question 4: Was the variability in projected scores related to children's pretest performance, age, handicap, or number of items rated?

FOR NUMBER OF ITEMS ONLY

Only number of items rated was significantly associated with variability in projected scores, and this relationship was relatively low ($r = .39$).

Question 5: How did actual test performance of children compare to projected score performance?

ACTUAL TEST PERFORMANCE EXCEEDED PROJECTED SCORE PERFORMANCE

Actual Bayley Motor and Mental scale scores were significantly ($p < .10$) greater than theoretical control scores for 12 home-center-based Project KIDS children. For 15 home-center-based children participating in the program the subsequent year (1977-1978) actual Bayley scores were not significantly greater than control scores but actual KIDS scores were significantly ($p < .05$) greater than control scores. The actual KIDS scores for 20 school-based Project KIDS children were significantly ($p < .05$) greater than control scores. The data supported the conclusion that Project KIDS improved students' developmental progress significantly beyond professional expectation, but the extent of progress may not have been as pronounced as during the first year.

Abstract

Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study

Evaluator: Alberta M. Rogers

Objectives of the Project: Project KIDS is an early intervention project for handicapped children. Services are delivered in a home-based training program, center-based infant stimulation classes, and school-based pre-school classrooms. The four components of the project are curriculum and appraisal, staff development, parent involvement and demonstration/dissemination. The major goal of services to children is to improve developmental progress.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The purpose of this research study was essentially to attempt replication of a previous study (1976-77) undertaken to investigate the application of an expert panel in projecting posttest scores of children to be used as a control comparison. The theoretical control strategy required a panel of experts in child development and early childhood education for the handicapped to project, independently, test score performance for children on the assumption of no treatment intervention. The average score projected by the panel then became the theoretical control score used in comparisons with actual test scores of children.

Results of the previous study showed that a theoretical control approach was feasible and yielded useful control data. This study was undertaken (1977-78) to secure control data for a larger sample of Project KIDS children and a second panel of experts. It was expected that this study would provide further data relative to the validity of the initial theoretical control study and also would provide data for further product evaluation of the project.

Sample: The sample included 52 children and five expert panel members. The five experts were Dr. Robert B. Hampson, Southern Methodist University, Ms. Betsy Kilday, Irving Independent School District, Dr. Jerry B. Hutton, East Texas State University, Dr. Caroline J. Mitchell, University of Texas at Dallas/Callier Center, and Ms. Susie Conrad, Texas Women's University. The 52 children sampled were nonrandomly selected from the population of children served in Project KIDS and included the 17 children from the previous study. Availability of pre-post scores resulted in the reduction of the sample to the following configuration:

Pre-Post Observed Scores

Placement	N	Bayley Scales	KIDS Inventory	Range in Age
Home-Center-Based (previous study)	17	12		Birth to 18 mos.
Home-Center-Based	15	12	15	4 mos. to 26 mos.
School-based	20		20	43 mos. to 71 mos.
Total	52	24	35	

Incomplete data from panel members precluded comparison of projected scores for all children. Complete theoretical control data were available for the following samples:

Projected Scores

Placement	N	Bayley Scale	KIDS Inventory
Home-Center-Based (previous study)	17	17	
Home-Center-Based	15	13	14
School-Based	20		15
Total	52	30	29

Evaluation Design: The design of the study included pre-post observations with the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and the KIDS Inventory of Development, and post observations with the theoretical control strategy. The design may be schematically represented as:

(Home-Center Based) $O_1 \ldots X_1 \ldots O_2$

$\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots O_3$

(Home-Center-Based) $O_4 \ldots X_2 \ldots O_5$

$\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots O_6$

(Home-Center-Based) $O_7 \ldots X_2 \ldots O_8$

$\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots O_9$

(School-Based) $O_{10} \ldots X_3 \ldots O_{11}$

$\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots O_{12}$

Where treatments X_1, X_2 and X_3 are exposure to the KIDS program, observations O_1, O_2, O_4 and O_5 are administrations of the Bayley scales and O_7, O_8, O_{10}, and O_{11} are administrations of the KIDS Inventory. The projections of the members of the panel of experts are represented as O_3 and O_6 for projections on the Bayley scales and as O_9 and O_{12} for projections on the KIDS Inventory.

The evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

1. What was the reliability of scores projected by experts?

2. What was the validity of scores projected by experts?

3. Did individual experts exhibit any systematic variance in the magnitude of their projections?

4. Was the variability in projected scores related to children's pretest performance, age, number of items rated, or handicap?

5. How did actual test score performance of children compare to projected score performance?

Evaluation Results:

1. The matrix of student-expert assignment resulted in six subsamples for projections on the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and eight subsamples for projections on the KIDS Inventory of Development. Reliability estimates of projected scores for both these instruments were generally consistent across subsamples. The internal consistency reliability coefficients computed on the projected scores for the Bayley Scales were lower than those for the KIDS Inventory, ranging from .49 to .98 on the Mental Scale and .47 to .95 on the Motor Scale. The reliability estimates for the Fine Motor and Cognitive/Language scales of the KIDS Inventory were consistently high with coefficients ranging from .88 to .96 and .84 to .98 respectively. The reliability estimates for the Gross Motor and Self-Care scales were more varied, ranging from .08 to .98 and .61 to .98. It would appear that the coefficients below .85 for the scales of the KIDS Inventory resulted from an idiosyncratic interaction of sampled students and experts. The reliability estimates for each subsample for the Bayley and the KIDS Inventory are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

   The reliability of these projected scores for the KIDS Inventory appear to be slightly better than the average coefficients (presented in Table 3) would indicate in that 84 percent of the reliability coefficients computed were greater than .85.

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients for the
Bayley Scales of Infant Development
on Selected Subsamples

Subsample	N	Reliability Coefficients			
		Mental		Motor	
		One Expert	Average of Two Experts	One Expert	Average of two Experts
1	6	.56	.71	.31	.47
2	4	.32	.49	.90	.95
3	5	.56	.71	.22	.37
4	4	.92	.96	.69	.81
5	6	.95	.98	.91	.95
6	5	.52	.68	.66	.80

Table 2

Reliability Coefficients for the KIDS Inventory of
Development on Selected Subsamples

Subsample	N[a]	Reliability Coefficients							
		Gross Motor		Fine Motor		Cognitive/ Language		Self-Care	
		One Expert	Average of two Experts	One Expert	Average of two Experts	One Expert	Average of two Experts	One Expert	Average of two Experts
1	5	.93	.97	.78	.88	.97	.98	.84	.92
2	4	.97	.98	.79	.89	.75	.89	.07	.13
3	12	.96	.98	.88	.94	.96	.98	.85	.92
4	6	.43	.61	.86	.92	.81	.89	.03	.08
5	10	.96	.98	.89	.94	.92	.96	.95	.98
6	6	.92	.96	.93	.96	.98	.99	.83	.91
7	14	.76	.87	.81	.89	.87	.93	.69	.82
8	9	.83	.91	.88	.94	.73	.84	.77	.87

[a]Reliability coefficients were computed for combinations of two experts for consistency of analysis, although some children received projections from three experts.

Table 3

Summary of Reliability
Estimates for each Scale Across
Subsamples

Scale	Average	Standard Deviation
Bayley Mental	.79	.19
Bayley Motor	.72	.25
KIDS Gross Motor	.91	.12
KIDS Fine Motor	.92	.03
KIDS Cognitive/Language	.93	.03
KIDS Self-Care	.70	.37

2. A comparison between scores projected by the panel of experts from the previous study with those projected by the current panel of experts was possible for seventeen children included in both studies. The current panel of experts were not familiar with the panelists or results of the first study but were provided an abbreviated history of the children and were asked to project scores for the same chronological age levels as were the first panel members. Results revealed no significant differences between projected scores of the panel of experts for either scale of the Bayley. This would appear to suggest that expectations of experts were similar for handicapped children who were not receiving any program of intervention from outside the home and would tend to support the theoretical control strategy as a valid approach for collection of control data. Table 4 presents the means, standard deviations and F-ratios for the average projected scores on the Bayley.

   Correlation coefficients between projected scores of the panels also reflected the agreement in the expectations among the panel members for developmental progress. The correlation coefficients for projected scores between panels were .96 on the mental scale and .92 on the motor scale.

3. Variability in the scores projected existed to some extent for each child. Analysis of the scores revealed that there were significant differences among experts on both scales. Of the four experts projecting scores on the Bayley scales, one, whose

Table 4

Comparison of Projected Scores from Previous Panel of Experts with those of Current Panel of Experts

Bayley Scale	Panel 1 (N=17; k[a]=4)	Panel 2 (N=17; k=4)	F	p
Mental				
Average	99.16	100.97	.07	NS[b]
Standard Deviation	31.75	30.56		
Motor				
Average	41.31	39.91	.79	NS
Standard Deviation	13.01	13.00		

[a] k = Number of panelists

[b] NS = Not significant ($p > .10$)

background was medicine, was consistently lower, and one, whose background was clinical psychology, was consistently higher. The same systematic variations in score magnitude were noted for these experts in projecting scores on the KIDS Inventory. In addition, a fifth expert, who projected scores only on the KIDS and whose background was occupational therapy, was found to be consistently lower in score projections. The remaining panel members, both psychologists, showed no consistent variation in projection of scores.

4. Other factors that might influence variability in projected scores were also investigated. The number of items projected was shown to have a significant influence on expert variability for scores projected on the KIDS Inventory Cognitive-Language Scale. Chronological age and expert variability appeared to be somewhat negatively associated on the Bayley Mental Scale. However, none of this influence was substantial in any pragmatic sense. Developmental level and handicap were relatively independent of expert variability.

5. Comparison of theoretical control scores to actual Bayley posttest scores, as presented in Table 5 showed statistically significant differences ($p < .10$) on both scales for a subsample of the Home-Center-Based children, replicating the results from the previous study. However, results of a comparison between projected and actual scores on a similar sample of children who participated in Project KIDS the succeeding year (i.e., the current study) resulted in no differences ($p > .10$).

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios for Projected and Actual Posttest Bayley Scores

Scale	Home-Center Based							
	Sample 1[a] (N=12; k=4)				Sample 2[b] (N=12; k=4)			
	Control	Actual	F	p	Control	Actual	F	p
Mental Scale								
Average	104.88	113	3.43	<.10	125.23	122.45	.37	NS
Standard deviation	34.36	42.46			19.76	24.79		
Motor Scale								
Average	39.77	47.45	4.74	<.10	51.32	49.55	1.27	NS
Standard deviation	15.59	21.21			8.19	10.14		

[a]Included in both the previous and current study.

[b]Included in only the current study.

It would appear at first as though the project was ineffective. However, scores from the KIDS Inventory tended to contradict this conclusion, suggesting that program effectiveness may not have been as pronounced as during the first year. The following schematic represents the comparison between control scores and treatment scores for both studies.

	Bayley Scales			KIDS Inventory		
1976-77 Study	Control Scores	<	Actual Scores	(Not observed)		
1977-1978 Study	Control Scores	=	Actual Score	Control Scores	<	Actual Scores

In the case of the Project KIDS evaluation, the differences between the control and treatment scores were significantly different ($p < .05$) for three of the four scales for both the Home- Center-Based sample and the School-Based sample. Results indicated that Home-Center-Based students progressed significantly beyond the panel's expectations in the areas of gross motor, cognitive-language and self-care. Significant gains for School-Based students were in the areas of gross motor, fine motor, and cognitive-language. These data are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios for Projected and Actual Posttest KID Scores

Scale	Home-Center-Based (N=14; k=5)				School-Based (N=15; k=5)			
	Control	Actual	F	p	Control	Actual	F	p
Gross Motor								
Average	44.61	48.43	6.61	<.05	62.21	65.53	8.66	<.05
Standard deviation	13.32	11.65			8.76	6.37		
Fine Motor								
Average	35.82	38.64	.42	NS	52.79	57.13	12.71	<.01
Standard deviation	13.12	9.44			7.61	9.21		
Cognitive-Language								
Average	41.64	48.71	6.10	<.05	71.98	90.67	72.45	<.10
Standard deviation	11.15	12.90			17.10	13.27		
Self-Care								
Average	27.54	34.71	10.81	<.01	52.36	56.07	1.39	NS
Standard deviation	10.63	10.60			4.88	6.19		

Conclusions

1. Findings from a previous study which indicated that the theoretical control strategy yielded useful control data appear to have been replicated in the current study. Comparison between panels of experts on projected Bayley scores for 17 home-center-based children resulted in correlation coefficients of .96 on the mental scale and .92 on the motor. In addition, the variance between panels in the projected scores was, on the average, only one or two items. This agreement in experts' expectations suggest that the use of the theoretical control approach would be useful for establishing the standards by which a handicapped child's developmental progress could be judged and thus determine the effectiveness of intervention strategies being provided.

2. The reliability of projected KIDS Inventory scores remained consistently high for the current study with 85 percent of the coefficients, computed for the subsamples, at .85 or higher. This again substantiates the findings of the previous study in which the reliability coefficents were at .87 or higher.

   The reliability estimates for the projected Bayley scores were not as readily interpretable, ranging from .37 to .98. Only 30 percent of the reliability coefficients, computed for the six subsamples, were at .85 or higher. It was suggested in the previous study that psychometric sophistication of the instrument might have some association with the variability of projected scores. While it seems reasonable to expect that scores projected on the Bayley would tend to be more consistent among experts due to its wide acceptance for measuring developmental status, it should be noted that the range of ages for which the Bayley is an appropriate measure is birth to 30 months while the KIDS Inventory includes ages birth to 72 months. The presence of the older children, for whom measures tend to be more reliable, in the sample tested with the KIDS Inventory may account for the disparity in the reliability estimates of the Bayley and the KIDS Inventory. Even including the younger children, however, the scores projected on the KIDS Inventory appeared reliable and relatively free of measurement error.

3. Conflicting results from the comparison of projected and actual scores on the Bayley and KIDS Inventory for 12 home-center-based children suggest that either program effectiveness has decreased or that the scores from the KIDS Inventory, to which project curriculum is inextricably tied, is a more appropriate measure of student progress than is the Bayley. Significant differences between projected and actual KIDS scores for 15 school-based children tend to support the latter conclusion.

4. Although questions concerning the validity of the theoretical control approach remained, this study tended to support the findings of the previous study. Conflicting results (i.e., reliability of projected scores and assessment of significant gains appear to be inconsistent across instruments) suggested several possibilities for further study before a definitive assessment of the feasibility and utility of the theoretical control approach could be made.

Additional Information:

Macy, Daniel J. Project KIDS Theoretical Control Group Study (Report No. SP78-110-31-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems, October, 1978.

Googles

KIDS Theoretical Control

1. Five experts independently projected developmental progress for 52 preschool handicapped children over a one-year interval.

2. Projected scores were generally reliable and probably valid.

3. Most experts were in agreement in terms of projected scores.

4. In most cases, Project KIDS children performed significantly better than the control comparison - the scores projected by experts.

5. In terms of developmental progress, the impact of the KIDS model was likely less dramatic than in previous years.

Reference:

Rogers, A. M. Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study, Research Report No. SP79-412-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, September, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Assistant Superintendent

CONTEXT EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMING FOR THE SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED

SP79-418-31-08

Alberta M. Rogers, M.Ed.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Project Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
June, 1979

Executive Summary

Context Evaluation of the Programming for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped

Evaluator: Alberta M. Rogers Approved: Robert P. Hudson

Question 1: What adaptations were identified which were necessary to assure availability of special education programming to severely and profoundly handicapped (SPH) children and youth?

Reported adaptations needed included: modified plumbing and furniture, ramps, handrails, additional aides, buses with modified seating, and direct therapeutic services from therapists and clinicians.

Question 2: With what success have alternative solutions to the adaptive problems been sought?

Most adaptations made were reasonably successful. Solutions are still being sought to resolve the problems of limited personnel such as teacher's aides, bus aides, substitutes, physical therapists, occupational therapists and speech clinicians.

Question 3: What was the instructional environment provided for SPH children?

Direct services were provided to 134 SPH students in 15 Developmental Centers and three Trainable Mentally Retarded Units (TMR) by a classroom teacher and at least one aide. Indirect services were provided by therapists and clinicians. Individualized Educational Programs (IEP) written for SPH students included objectives in four developmental areas: (1) motor development, (2) cognitive/language development, (3) self-help skills, and (4) social development.

Question 4: What services were being provided to parents of SPH children?

Services provided to parents were consistent with Public Law 94-142 as specified in Texas Education Agency (TEA) guidelines and included opportunities for active participation in the referral, assessment and placement process,

development of the IEP and extension of the IEP into the home.

Question 5: What developmental progress was observed in participating children?

In a limited sample (N=9) of students, progress was observed for each student in at least two of the five subscales of the Callier-Azusa Developmental Scales.

Question 6: What were the contributions of other institutions in the implementation of SPH programming in the public schools?

The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) Project SPICY (Severely and Profoundly Impaired Children and Youth) provided staff development and parent training and was considered a helpful contributor by 53 percent of the teachers in the Development Centers and TMR Units.

Abstract

Context Evaluation of Programming
for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped

Evaluator: Alberta M. Rogers

Objective of the Program: As a result of recent legislation, such as Public Law 94-142 which mandates access to a free appropriate education in the least restrictive environment, those once unserved because of the severity of their physical or mental handicaps are now entering the public schools. Programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped (SPH) children in the District had as its nucleus the Developmental Center. The instructional program provided training in areas such as self-help, motor development and language development. Direct services to SPH children in the form of instructional and developmental activities were conducted by the Developmental Center teacher. Indirect services were provided by physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech clinicians, and medical personnel. Special facilities, equipment, materials and transportation were also provided.

Indirect services were also provided through Project SPICY (Severely and Profoundly Impaired Children and Youth). A model program cooperatively implemented by the District and the University of Dallas at Texas, Project SPICY participated in providing in-service training to District staff and training to parents of participating students. The Project was implemented at the 13 Developmental Center sites and at the Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) units located in Hillcrest North High School.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The purpose of this study was to determine the instructional, administrative, and community implications relating to the provision of services to the severely and profoundly handicapped. Results were expected to describe areas of need and the extent to which alternative solutions might be successfully applied.

Sample: Students placed by the area Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) Committee in the Developmental Centers constituted the student population. Those students numbered 110 in the Developmental Centers at the following campus sites: Atwell, George Washington Carver, Casa View, City Park, Nancy Jane Cochran, Leil P. Cowart, Everette L. De Golyer, J. Leslie Patton, Thomas C. Hassell, Victor H. Hexter, G. H. Macon, Ben Milam, Thomas L. Marsalis, and John W. Runyon. Also included

in the study were 24 older students placed at the three TMR units at Hillcrest North High School. These students, who represent about 11 percent of the population of students in TMR units Districtwide, were included because 11 of the 24 participated in Project SPICY. The instructional placement of students included in the study is shown below:

Campus Site	Number of Students Participating in SPICY	Total Number of Students
Atwell	4	4
Carver	2	7
Casa View	5	6
City Park	5	12
Cochran	1	6
Cowart	2	8
De Golyer	6	15
Patton	2	5
Hexter	2	6
Hassell	2	6
Macon	4	6
Marsalis	5	16
Milam	4	8
Runyon	3	5
Hillcrest North	11	24
	Total 98	Total 134

From this group of 134 students, three subsamples were drawn. Achievement data were to be collected for the 58 students selected for participation in Project SPICY. These students were selected based on their identification as being among the most severely handicapped in the original population. Due to the severity of the handicaps, only 52 of the 58 were administered the Callier-Azusa Developmental Scale in the fall. The remaining students were not at school due to extended illnesses and hospitalization. Support for this aspect of the program was withdrawn by the District at mid-year which precluded the posttesting of all but nine students in the spring.

A review of Individualized Educational Programs (IEP) was conducted for a sample of 50 students randomly selected. The IEP for this study was defined as a written statement of what will actually be provided to the student. The District-developed "Form 5.0" was used as the one document which contained all elements required by law and which was generally available for all students. The resulting sample was as follows:

Availability of IEP	Number	Percent
Current IEP (written 11-78)	32	64%
IEP (written before 11-78)	10	20%
No IEP[1]	8	16%

A subsample of 14 students was drawn from the 32 for whom current IEPs were available. These IEPs were submitted to a panel for rating according to the appropriateness of the IEP. The panel consisted of the following District staff:

Position	Location
Speech Therapist	Northeast Subdistrict
Occupational Therapist	Northwest Subdistrict
Psychologist	Project Zero Reject Team
Educational Diagnostician	Project Zero Reject Team
Home-School Coordinator	Project Zero Reject Team
Nurse	Project Zero Reject Team

Principals at each of the 14 campus sites, TMR and Developmental Center teachers, parents of the severely and profoundly handicapped students, and selected parents of students in regular education classrooms at each of the sites were surveyed for this study. The resulting sample configurations were as follows:

Category	Number surveyed	Number responding	Percent
Classroom teacher Special Education	19	13	68%
Administrator	16	12	75%
Parent of SPH child	134	53	40%
Parent of nonhandicapped child	52	12	23%

[1]The 5.0 forms for these students were in process and had not yet been filed.

Evaluation Design: The design of the study may be represented by the following schematic:

Students		
Review of IEP	(R)	O_1---X
Callier-Azusa Scale		O_2---X---O_3
Parents		X---O_4
Teachers		X---O_5
Administrators		X---O_6

Where treatment X represents exposure to the programming provided for the severely and profoundly handicapped, and observation O_1 is the review of IEPs, O_2 and O_3 are pre/post administrations of the Callier-Azusa Developmental Scales, O_4 is the Parent Questionnaire, O_5 is the Teacher Survey and O_6 is the Administrator Questionnaire.

Survey observations were analyzed by computing frequency distributions where appropriate or by narrative summary. Student achievement data were examined for individual differences and not submitted to tests of statistical significance. Data from the survey of parents of students in regular education classrooms were not analyzed since the number of parents responding was extremely limited.

The major evaluation questions were:

1. What adaptations were identified which were necessary to assure availability of special education programming to severely and profoundly handicapped (SPH) children and youth?

2. With what success have alternative solutions to the adaptive problems been sought?

3. What was the instructional environment provided for SPH children?

4. What services were being provided to parents of SPH children?

5. What developmental progress was observed in participating children?

6. What were the contributions of other institutions in the implementation of SPH programming in the public schools?

60

Evaluation Results:

Instructional Environment

1. The sixteen Developmental Centers and the three Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) units at Hillcrest North served 134 severely and profoundly handicapped students during the 1978-1979 school year. These students were characterized as having at least two of the impairments which follow: (1) inability to walk, (2) severe retardation, (3) self-stimulating or self-abusive behaviors, and (4) self-care skill deficits. Approximately 83 percent were described as Trainable Mentally Retarded. The students ranged in age from three to 21 and there were almost twice as many boys (N=89) as girls (N=45). A summary of student characteristics is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Students by Placement, Sex, Ethnicity, Age and Handicap

Units	N	White		Black		Hispanic		Average Age (Years)	Handicap[a]			
		Boy	Girl	Boy	Girl				TMR	OH	TMR OH	Other
Developmental Center	110	12	11	48	17	13	9	9.2	44	12	35	19
TMR	24	5	4	8	2	3	2	16.3	20	-	-	4
Total	134	24%		56%		20%		12.5	48%	9%	26%	17%

[a] TMR = Trainable Mentally Retarded; OH = Orthopedically Handicapped

Direct services were provided by a classroom teacher and at least one aide. In addition, indirect services were provided by physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech clinicians, psychologists, health personnel, home-school coordinators, educational diagnosticians as well as regular education staff where appropriate. The instructional program provided training in the areas of self-help, motor development, and language development. The median developmental age for these students ranged from seven months to 27 months across the 18 subscales of the Callier-Azusa as shown for the sample of 52 students in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Developmental Age
for Subscales of Callier-Azusa

Callier-Azusa Developmental Subscales	Median Developmental Age in Months
Posture Control	18 mos.
Locomotion	15 mos.
Fine Motor Skills	14 mos.
Perceptual Motor	18 mos.
Visual	9 mos.
Auditory	12 mos.
Tactile	24 mos.
Dressing and Undressing	15 mos.
Personal Hygiene	15 mos.
Feeding Skills	27 mos.
Toileting Skills	28 mos.
Cognitive	8 mos.
Receptive Language	11 mos.
Expressive Language	9 mos.
Speech	8 mos.
Adult Socialization	12 mos.
Interaction with Peers	7 mos.
Interaction with Environment	7 mos.

Speech, expressive language and social development were the areas of most repressed development. For these areas the level of functioning for a typical student was similar to that level of an eight- or nine- month old infant. Data from the review of IEPs revealed that goals and objectives written for SPH students generally addressed the areas of need as reflected by scores on the Callier-Azusa. Goals were written in the area of cognitive/language development for 81 percent of the students; in the area of perceptual/motor development for 79 percent; in the area of self-help development for 52 percent; and in the area of social development for 31 percent. The average number of annual goals for each student was five and the average number of objectives was six. Special services of an occupational therapist, physical therapist or speech therapist were specified in about one-third of the IEPs.

Specific educational programs for each student were judged by the panel of experts to be technically complete and adequate to meet the needs of the students for whom they were written. A summary of ratings is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Summary of Overall Ratings
by Panel of Experts for IEPs

Rating	Percent (N=14)
Excellent, responsive to most of the student's needs	6%
Good, responsive to some of the student's needs	23%
Adequate, somewhat responsive to the student's needs	45%
Inadequate, not at all responsive to the student's needs	21%
No rating, overall	5%

Student Progress

2. Product data were extremely limited. Pretest/posttest administrations of the Callier-Azusa developmental scale for nine students from four Developmental Centers indicated progress for students in at least two of the five areas. The time between the administrations was about six months with the pretest given in November, 1978, and the posttest in May, 1979. Two students scored lower on the posttest in at least one area. The change in months for each area is shown in Table 4.

Adaptations

3. Responses of adminstrators and teachers were mixed when asked to identify the unique needs of a severely and profoundly handicapped (SPH) population. Overall, administrators perceived the needs of the SPH students to be related to the physical facilities and classroom personnel. Approximately 75 percent of the administrators surveyed (N=12) reported no adaptations other than physical facilities. These adaptations included carpeting, wheelchair ramps, handrails, lower toilets, sinks and water fountains (all with adaptive fixtures), and smaller tables, chairs and shelves. Most adaptations had been completed satisfactorily with the exception of adaptive plumbing at three sites and

Table 4

Pretest-Posttest Change in Developmental Age
for Scales of Callier-Azusa

Student	Motor Development	Perceptual Development	Daily Living Skills	Cognitive/ Language Development	Socialization
1	3 mos.	-36 mos.	0 mos.	-6 mos.	1 mo.
2	1 mo.	9 mos.	3 mos.	5 mos.	2 mos.
3	0 mos.	2 mos.	0 mos.	2 mos.	3 mos.
4	0 mos.	0 mos.	7 mos.	0 mos.	1 mo.
5	2 mos.	9 mos.	9 mos.	1 mo.	1 mo.
6	0 mo.	0 mo.	5 mos.	-2 mos.	0 mos.
7	8 mos.	6 mos.	3 mos.	0 mos.	9 mos.
8	1 mo.	8 mos.	6 mos.	2 mos.	0 mos.
9	7 mos.	0 mos.	9 mo	10 mos.+	13 mos.

handrails at three sites. Availability of teacher's aides and qualified substitutes was reported as a problem by 50 percent of the administrators. An additional aide was assigned at two sites, while three other sites reported the use of parents, early childhood aides, and aides assigned to lunch room duty only in place of full time aides. Substitutes for teachers and aides remained a problem and administrators reported very little success in determining alternative solutions.

Teachers identified the provision of support personnel as being the most unique need of the severely and profoundly handicapped student. Approximately 40 percent of the teachers responding (N=13) indicated that direct therapeutic services from physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech clinicians, psychologists and visiting teachers were needed by the SPH student but were unavailable due to limited personnel. Teachers reported that support personnel available on a consultative basis only was not a successful solution because of "disorganization" of the many departments and lack of coordination of the services. Two alternative solutions perceived by the teachers as successful were the additions of a half-time liaison from the Dallas Mental Health Mental Retardation Association (MHMR) to assist teachers in classroom management and the services provided by the supervisor of parent trainers from the University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) Project SPICY.

Parent Involvement

4. Data indicated that opportunities for involvement provided by the District to parents of severely and profoundly handicapped children were in accordance with Public Law 94-142. Parents (N=53) who responded to a questionnaire reported involvement in the six areas presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Summary of Parental Involvement

Area of Involvement	Percent (N=55)
Notification of referral for special education	100%
Permission granted for assessment	100%
Notification of IEP development meetings	100%
Active participation in development of IEP	85%
Participation in Parent-Teacher Conferences	98%
Extension of IEP into the home	62%

Parents (N=33) who were involved in implementing a program for their child in the home reported helpful assistance from Project SPICY personnel (19%), Dallas Mental Health Mental Retardation (MHMR) personnel (9%) and District home school coordinators (6%).

Contributing Institutions

5. Responses of teachers (N=13) indicated that the University of Texas at Dallas (53%) and the Dallas Mental Health Mental Retardation Association (24%) contributed more than other institutions or agencies to district programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped. The contributions of UTD were cited in conjunction

with Project SPICY which provided staff development and parent training to participating District students' teachers and parents. The staff development provided by UTD included 12 sessions which addressed behavior management, feeding, positioning, toileting, curriculum, language acquisition and other subjects. The staff development sessions were generally rated as helpful (90%). The contributions of MHMR included the services of a liaison between the District and MHMR by which many of the District SPH students had previously been served. Other contributors included the Dallas Association for Retarded Citizens in the form of transportation and the Scottish Rite Hospital in the form of medical services.

Googles

SPH

1. Direct services were provided to 134 SPH students in four developmental areas: motor, cognitive/language, self-help and social development.

2. Adaptations to special education programming included: modified plumbing, furniture, transportation, ramps and handrails; services of therapists and clinicians; additional aides.

3. Parents took an active part in developing their children's educational programming.

4. Teachers and parents described Project SPICY as a helpful contributor to SPH programming.

Reference:

Rogers, A. M. Context Evaluation of Programming for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped, Research Report No. SP79-418-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, June, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster

EVALUATION OF THE STRUCTURED ENVIRONMENT FOR THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED (SEED) PROJECT

SP79-430-31-08

Donald E. Hawkins, B.A.S.
and
Alberta M. Rogers, M.Ed.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Project Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
June, 1979

Executive Summary

Evaluation of the Structured Environment
for the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project

Evaluators: Donald E. Hawkins
Alberta M. Rogers

Approved: Robert P. Lobe

Question 1: What was the environment of Project SEED?

Fifty-three students were served at H. C. Withers Elementary School and Hillcrest North High School. The average I. Q., as measured by the WISC, for the 26 secondary and 27 elementary students was 72.2. Staff included two project managers, seven teachers, four teacher's aides, three psychologists, one home-school coordinator, and an educational diagnostician.

Question 2: Was Project SEED implemented as specified?

Those components of Project SEED observed as implemented as specified included: (1) parental involvement and therapeutic interventions at H. C. Withers, and behavior management strategies (excluding the use of the 'crisis room' facility) at Hillcrest North.

Variations in specified implementation included: (1) building modifications not completed, (2) a procedural change in behavior management strategies at Withers because management determined the awarding of intangible social points to be too abstract for elementary students, (3) therapeutic interventions not provided at Hillcrest at consistent and specified periods, and (4) placement of specified personnel not completed until March, 1979.

Question 3: To what degree was the project successful in developing a model for movement from a restrictive to a least restrictive environment?

Criterion for student movement was determined to have been inconsistent with stated project goals and objectives as students could advance from Level I to Level II without displaying any reduction in disruptive ac-

tivities or increased academic work proficiency. Movement between Levels was experienced by 34 (64%) of the students. Re-integration into the regular classroom was attempted for three (11%) students.

Question 4: To what extent was Project SEED successful in reducing disciplinary referrals, suspension rates, disruptive behaviors, and truancy rates and to what extent was it successful in increasing student self-concept and academic achievement?

Six (11.3%) of the project students appeared to exhibit some decrease in their disruptive behaviors. No other definitive assessment of reduction patterns could be made. There were four referrals and no suspensions at Withers. At Hillcrest, there were four referrals and 18 suspensions. The daily average attendance at Withers was 81.4 percent and 43.4 percent at Hillcrest. Five (9.4%) students dropped out.

Question 5: What was the reaction of parents, teachers, staff members, and administrators to the project?

Parents (N=12) of project students reported favorable reactions to the school and the program. Teachers and staff at the elementary site also reacted postively. Teachers and staff at Hillcrest reported both positive (36%) and negative (30%) reactions to the project.

Question 6: What were the cost considerations involved in developing and implementing Project SEED?

The first year costs were approximately $27.39 per student-day above the regular district per child expenditure. The largest percentage of this cost was for project personnel other than teachers and aides.

Abstract

Evaluation of the Structured Environment
For the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project

Evaluators: Donald E. Hawkins and Alberta M. Rogers

Objectives of the Project: The Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project was designed to organize the instructional ecology for more severely disturbed students through the provision of carefully sequenced experiences designed to enable them to function successfully in other instructional settings in special and regular education. The sequence was to be provided on all grade levels from K-12. The focus of the sequence was the provision of carefully identified increments of learning provided within three structured levels of the project which were to allow the severely disturbed student to be accommodated in increasingly less restrictive environments from Level I through Level III. Level I was to employ a highly structured token economy using one to one instruction with short work tasks to develop school appropriate behaviors. Level II was to emphasize the refinement of academic and social skills utilizing individual contracts with instruction to be provided on a one to one and small group basis. Level III was to employ the natural contingencies found in regular classrooms with increased behavioral expectations. The components of the three level structured environment included behavior management strategies, curriculum interventions, parental involvement, and therapeutic interventions (group and individual counseling support).

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation of project SEED focused on providing decision-makers with information relative to the degree of program implementation, the attitudes of teachers, staff members, and parents toward the program, and the achievements of the students. Results were expected to assist in determining the extent of program implementation, it's effectiveness, and in determining whether or not the program should be modified.

Sample: The treatment group student sample consisted of 53 students, 52 of whom were identified through a multidisciplinary process as severly emotionally disturbed and met the Texas eligibility requirements consistent with P.L. 94-142. One student was identified via the same process as minimal brain injured. These students were selected for placement in the program by the District's Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) committee and project management. This sample consisted of 26 elementary students and 27 secondary students who participated at some time during the period from January 1, 1979 to April 30, 1979.

The control group consisted of elementary and middle school age students (N=13) who matched project students placed in the elementary component on the variables of age, sex, ethnicity, intellectual functioning and primary handicap.

The staff sample consisted of seven teachers, three psychologists, four aides, one educational diagnostician, one home-school coordinator and two managers assigned to the Project. The regular education staff sample included all other teachers and administrators at both project sites, 27 of whom respoonded to the reaction questionnaire. Parents of students assigned to the project component at the elementary site constituted the parent sample and 12 responded to the parent questionnaire.

Evaluation Design: Implementation of the program was assessed during the period from October 1, 1979 to May 30, 1979. Data collected included observations of project classrooms on two occasions in March, 1979 and observations of four non-project District classrooms in April, 1979. Additional process evaluation activities included collection of student attendance data, behavior data and parental involvement data from management records, the District data base and the special education data base. These data were analyzed by computing frequency distributions for attendance, behavior and parental involvement. Narrative summaries were written from the observation of project and non-project classrooms.

Student product evaluation data were collected within a pretest posttest design represented schematically below:

$$\begin{matrix} O_1\text{-}X\text{-}O_2 \\ \text{-----}O_3 \end{matrix}$$

where X represents participation in Project SEED and O_1 and O_2 are the pre- and posttest administrations of the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) for project students and O_3 the posttest administration of the WRAT for control students.

End of year reaction data was also collected from parents and regular education staff.

The major evaluation questions were:

1. What was the environment of Project SEED?

2. Was the SEED project implemented as specified?

3. To what degree was the project successful in developing a model for movement from a restrictive to a least restrictive educational environment?

4. To what extent was Project SEED successful in reducing disciplinary referrals, suspension rates, disruptive behaviors, and truancy rates and to what extent was it successful in increasing student self-concept and academic achievements?

5. What was the reaction of parents, teachers, staff members and administrators to the project?

6. What were the cost considerations involved in developing and implementing Project SEED?

Evaluation Results:

Implementation

1. Project SEED was implemented in two schools located on District campuses where the regular continuum of curriculum and student services were provided in both regular and special education classrooms. All elementary (K-6) students served at H. C. Withers resided within the Northwest Subdistrict. The secondary (7-12) students served at Hillcrest North were assigned from home school locations throughout all five subdistricts. A total of 53 students, 26 elementary and 27 secondary, identified as severely emotionally disturbed were served by the project. The ethnicity of the project population was somewhat representative of the District with 47 percent (N=25) White, 43 percent (N=23) Black, and nine percent (N=5) Hispanic. Male students were overrepresented with a total of 41 or 77.4 percent. This overrepresentation is typical throughout the District. Information from the Special Education Data Base revealed that about 80 percent of the students diagnosed as emotionally disturbed are males. The intellectural functioning of the population as measured by the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), was described as low average. The average intelligence quotient was 72.2. The scores ranged from 51 to 102. The sex and ethnicity of the treatment student population are shown in Table 1.

   Project staff consisted of two project managers/psychologists, three psychologists, seven teachers, four aides, one educational diagnostician and a home-school coordinator. Their experience with emotionally disturbed students ranged from one-half to ten years with an average of 3.8 years of experience.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Students
by Sex and Ethnicity

School Site	White				Black				Hispanic			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hillcrest	10	19%	2	4%	11	21%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Withers	10	19%	3	5%	5	9%	3	5%	5	9%	0	0%
Total	20	38%	5	9%	16	30%	7	13%	5	9%	0	0%

2. Data collected during the process evaluation indicated that problems in implementing the project as specified existed at both sites. The home-school coordinator and the educational diagnostician were not available to the project until January, 1979, and March, 1979, respectively, due to difficulties in filling their vacated assignments within the District. Teacher's aides experienced in working with severely emotionally disturbed students were difficult to find and the salary scale was reportedly insufficient to keep them once employed.

   Building modifications for the sites have not been begun as of this writing. Existing space sufficient for classrooms, "breakrooms", and office space were allocated to the project at both sites. The secondary site was also allocated room for group counseling and "time-out." A crisis room did not exist at either site. The Project Management Team has been involved in determining appropriate architectural and procedural guidelines to provide for legal, ethical, and educational safeguards and plans for contruction of the crisis rooms have been forwarded to the proper persons.

   Project components of curriculum and therapeutic intervention, behavior management and parental involvement were observed as implemented as specified with some exceptions. Emphasis on parental involvement occurred at the elementary site only. The number and style of parental contacts are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

Number and Style of Parental Contacts

School	Home Visits	Telephone Conferences	School Conferences
Hillcrest	17	80	19
Withers	27	86	67

Although the program emphasis is toward emotional/behavior growth, the behavioral systems and the instructional systems were philosophically tied together. Classroom observation indicated a need for a systematic approach to curriculum intervention to facilitate individualization of instruction and progression through the levels of the project.

Therapeutic intervention (supportive counseling) was implemented as specified at the elementary site as group and individual counseling occurred at consistent and specified periods. Specified implementation of supportive counseling was not met at the secondary site as a result of psychologists frequently having to take on responsibilities of a teacher's aide, and as a result of not having clearly defined goals for group counseling. It was noted, however, that informal individual counseling occurred during students' interactions with psychologists in the classroom and in other places outside the classroom.

Behavior management strategies could not be completely implemented as specified due to a lack of specified "time-out" and "crisis" room facilities. Other behavior management strategies were initially implemented as specified across project sites. A procedural change was later implemented at the elementary site. The change came in the area of the criterion for student advancement between Level I and Level II. Whereas the number (200) of social points earned was the original specified criterion, the percentage (80%) of earnable tokens actually and consistently earned across time was later used as the criterion for student advancement from Level I to Level II at the elementary site.

Student Progress

3. Since movement to a least restrictive environment was dependent on a continuum of alternative placements available beyond the project, an assessment of model success was not definitive. Of the 26 students enrolled at the elementary site, 14 (53%) moved from Level I to Level II. Although less structured than Level I, Level II provides for no interaction with nonhandicapped peers. At the secondary site, 20 (74%) of the students enrolled moved from Level I to Level II and four (15%) moved from Level II to Level III. Re-integration into the regular classroom was attempted for three (11%) students. Two of the latter students were returned to project classrooms, one at the request of parents and the other due to District policy. Only one student was moved to a lower level structure due to failure in maintaining appropriate behaviors.

   It should be noted that student movement from Level I to Level II could be obtained without the student displaying any reduction in disruptive activities or increased academic work proficiency. At the elementary site, any student that was in seat, on task and quiet at specified time intervals could obtain enough tokens with enough regularity to be advanced to Level II. The criterion did not emphasize work completion or increased proficiency. Students at the secondary site received 20 social points for coming to school (on time) each day. Points were then taken away in accordance with inappropriate behaviors exhibited thereafter. A student could be disruptive on a daily basis and still manage to accumulate the 200 social points needed to advance to Level II. Project management is currently in the process of developing a manual for behavior management procedures which will incorporate criteria for student advancement which are more consistent with project goals and objectives.

4. Overall, no appreciable reduction in disruptive behaviors was noted, as measured by "time-out" incidents at the elementary site and teachers' daily charts of earned social points and fines at the secondary site. Social points were used as a measure of the frequency of disruptive behaviors for only the Level I students at the secondary site. Points earned by Level II students were measures of the amount of work tasks completed. The percent of social points earned by Level I students at the secondary site and the percent of "time-out" incidents for all students at the elementary site are illustrated in Table 3 for periods of observation in January (or at entry to the program) and in April (or at exit from the program). Six (11.3%) of the project students appeared to exhibit some decrease in the frequency of their disruptive behaviors. Records indicated that six (22%) students were

Table 3

Percent of Earned Social Points and Percent of Time-Out Incidents for Entry and Exit Periods

HILLCREST NORTH			H. C. WITHERS		
Percent of Earned Social Points For Entry and Exit Observation Periods			Percent of Time Out Incidents For Entry and Exit Observation Periods		
Student	Entry	Exit	Student	Entry	Exit
1	30%	0%	1	43%	7%
2	100%	67%	2	34%	3%
3	0%	0%	3	21%	14%
4	0%	0%	4	28%	57%
5	57%	0%	5	38%	0%
6	100%	83%	6	7%	7%
7	51%	2%	7	10%	52%
8	30%	2%	8	0%	64%
9	95%	42%	9	15%	33%
10	85%	100%	10	0%	0%
11	100%	100%	11	60%	20%
12	75%	20%	12	8%	67%
13	13%	0%	13	10%	30%
14	18%	94%	14	14%	57%
			15	20%	22%
			16	50%	0%
			17	20%	0%
			18	7%	27%
			19	13%	38%
			20	22%	44%
			21	0%	0%
			22	0%	33%

responsible for approximately 83 percent of the disruptive behaviors at the secondary site. No other definitive assessment of reduction patterns could be made with the rate of attendance seemingly not a mediating variable.

Process evaluation data indicated that student discipline, as a rule, was handled within the emotionally disturbed units by the psychologists rather than referral to the principal or counselor. There were only eight referrals for discipline recorded for project students. Four referrals occurred at each project site. In comparison, five of the students in the control group were referred for discipline on 60 occasions. Formal suspensions numbered 18 at the secondary project site and zero at the elementary site. There were seven suspensions involving elementary control group students. Most of the 18 suspensions occurred as a result of students having committed various crimes such as theft, arson, and assault which necessitated the involvement of juvenile authorities. No records of informal suspensions were maintained.

Attendance at the secondary site was complicated by two factors; one was the distance some students were bused and the other was the lack of well-defined procedures for follow-up on attendance between the project school and the students home school. Daily average attendance was 43.4 percent, calculated as the quotient of the average number of students enrolled and the average number of students attending. At the elementary site, daily average attendance was 81.5 percent. These rates remained consistent across time. Previous individual attendance records from the district-wide data base were not complete and were maintained by course rather than daily, which precluded any useful comparisons. Group attendance rates across four consecutive 20 day periods are shown in Table 4.

The drop-out rate for project students was 9.43 percent involving five students at the secondary site. The drop-out rate for emotionally disturbed students district-wide was lower at 1.61 percent.

No determination of academic progress could be made due to the unavailability of post-treatment Wide Range Achievement Test scores. The April test scores were apparently either misplaced, accidently destroyed, or taken from the project sites by a person or persons unknown.

Changes, if any, in student self-concept were not measured because of the lack of an appropriate measure acceptable to both project management and District administrators.

Table 4

Group Attendance Rates

Time Period	H. C. WITHERS Daily Average Enrollment	Daily Average Attendance	Percent	HILLCREST NORTH Daily Average Enrollment	Daily Average Attendance	Percent
1st 20 Days	12	10.3	85.8%	18.2	8	44.0%
2nd 20 Days	12.2	9.8	80.3%	22.3	9.5	42.6%
3rd 20 Days	12.5	10.3	82.4%	25.5	10.9	42.7%
4th 20 Days	10.7	8.3	77.6%	21.7	9.6	42%

Environmental Impact

5. Surveyed parents (N=12) of project students reacted positively to the program whereas the nonproject teachers, staff members, and administrators surveyed (N=27) indicated mixed reactions. Forty-two percent (N=5) of the parents indicated a positive change in their attitude toward District special education programs and ninety-two percent (N=11) indicated an increased positive attitude toward their child since their child's participation in the program. All parents (100%) surveyed indicated a positive reaction to Project SEED.

   The reaction of nonproject teachers, staff, and administrators at the elementary site to Project SEED was overwhelmingly positive (100%). At the secondary site, the reactions were mixed; thirty six percent (N=6) reported positive reactions, eighteen percent (N=3) reported no reaction and thirty percent (N=5) reported a negative reaction. The consensus appeared to be that deviation from the school's regulations and schedules for the SEED students was resented. Teachers also reported that they were glad the project existed in order to remove these students from their responsibility.

Cost Considerations

6. Costs specific to the project included personnel (other than classroom teachers and aides), travel for professional development, equipment for breakroom entertainment and classroom behavior management, supplies, consultants and building modifications. For the first year these totaled $133,712.00. The additional daily expenditure per child above the regular District per child expenditure was about $27.39. This cost was based on the daily average enrollment and the daily average attendance for the 80 school days under consideration, or approximately 2,231 "student-days." A total of 4,881 student-days was derived by projecting the overall attendance rate across a full school year (175 days) and based on the 80 day student-day count.

Googles

SEED

1. The project served 53 emotionally disturbed students at two sites.

2. A majority of the students (64%) progressed behaviorally toward the less structured environments and three students returned to regular education classrooms.

3. The rate of attendance at the elementary site was 81.4 percent and 43.4 at the secondary site.

4. Parents reacted favorably to the program.

5. Costs per student exceeded the regular District per child expenditure by $27.39.

Reference:

Hawkins, D. E. and Rogers, A. M. Evaluation of the Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project, Research Report No. SP79-430-41-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, June, 1979.

Dallas Independent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE MULTIPLE CAREERS MAGNET AND ASSESSMENT CENTERS AT WILLIAM B. CARRELL, 1978-79

SP79-434-31-08

Wayne Maples, B.S
Karen Cortell Reisman, B.S.
Jenci Kocsis, M.S.
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Wayne R. Murray, Ph.D.

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator
Special Programs Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and Development

Dallas, Texas
October, 1979

Executive Summary

Evaluation of the Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Centers at William B. Carrell, 1978-79

Evaluators: Jenci Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy
Wayne Maples
Wayne R. Murray
Karen C. Reisman

Approved: _____

_____

Question 1: What were the demographic characteristics of students and faculty at the Multiple Careers Magnet Center (MCMC) and Assessment Center?

The MCMC enrollment (64) consisted of mildly handicapped special education students. The majority of the students were either mentally retarded or minimally brain injured (66%). The MCMC distributions for sex and ethnicity were representative of the District Special Education distributions. The student body was 63% male. The ethnic representation was 48% Black, 6% Hispanic and 45% White.

The Assessment Center provided vocational assessment for 120 Special Education students. A majority of these students were male (60%). The ethnic distribution was 49% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 45% White.

The MCMC instructional staff included four males and two females. The staff was all White with the highest degree earned as follows: three were teaching on vocational certificates, two had a Bachelor, and one had a Master. The Assessment Center staff included two males and four females. [illegible] one Black, four White and one Hispanic staff members earned the following degrees: three had a Master and three had a Doctorate.

Question 2: What were the characteristics of the Advisory Committee for the MCMC?

The committee members were handicap personnel specialists or professionals involved in the vocational areas at the MCMC.

Question 3: What curricular experiences were available at the MCMC?

(1) Building and Grounds Maintenance curricular experiences included cleaning (i.e., dusting, sweeping, washing), gardening, basic plumbing, carpentry (i.e., door hanging, sheetrocking), electrical repairs (i.e., changing fuses and bulbs), painting and paper hanging, and glazing.

(2) Dry Cleaning and Laundry included sorting clothing, use of washing machines, spot removal, and use of hand press for ironing.

(3) Furniture Repairs and Upholstery included sewing, measuring and cutting fabric, making slip covers and furniture buttons, spring tying, and the use of upholstery tools.

(4) General Construction included learning the use of hand tools used in carpentry, identifying construction woods and their uses, flooring, wall construction, roofing, wall covering, molding, and finishing.

(5) Food Service included learning the uses of basic food processing equipment, proportioning in food, weighing and measuring ingredients, reading recipes, sanitation, serving, and busing.

(6) Commercial Sewing and Homemaking included sewing, home laundry, home cleaning, personal hygiene, and grooming.

Question 4: What problems were observed or reported in the transportation of students to the MCMC and Assessment Center?

Students attending the MCMC in the afternoon were delivered 30 or more minutes late and, in many cases, were picked up 50 or more minutes late. At least part of the problem derived from the 12:30 - 3:30 p.m. afternoon schedule. Students in the other magnets had an afternoon departure time of 4:10 p.m. or later. On the basis of this information, the afternoon schedule has been changed to 1 p.m. - 4 p.m. to bring the MCMC into line with the other magnets.

Question 5: Were the Individual Educational Programs completed and instructionally functional for all MCMC students? YES

Question 6: What were MCMC students, parents, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC? HIGHLY FAVORABLE

The students were happy in the MCMC: 96% liked their teacher, 89% felt that the teacher liked them, 92% were happy in their career cluster, and 92% would want their friends to be able to go to the MCMC. When asked why they were happy to be in their career cluster, 42% responded that they were learning a trade, 37% responded that the cluster was fun, and 11% responded that they were learning useful work skills. For students planning to get a job after graduation, 82% plan to get a job in the career cluster area.

Interviews with parents revealed that they were pleased with the MCMC. In general, parents recommended the MCMC because (a) their children were happy in the MCMC, (b) the MCMC teachers were interested in their children and/or, (c) their children were learning a trade. Most parents felt that their children were better behaved, had better attitudes, or were more self-confident due to their experiences at the MCMC.

Teachers maintained a warm relationship with the students while at the same time they encouraged self-growth among the students. Teachers generally held positive attitudes concerning the MCMC program.

Question 7: What were the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and the Assessment Center?

Concerning program guidelines, 94% of teachers and nearly two-thirds of area and local professionals responded that they knew that the Assessment Center was designed to evaluate students' ability to benefit from any district-wide vocational program. Opinions were evenly divided concerning whether the requirement for enrollment in three consecutive quarters restricted the number of referable students to the MCMC. Respondents were also evenly divided concerning whether the particular career clusters at the MCMC limited the number of eligible students.

Question 8: What administrative tasks and/or procedures were used to initiate the MCMC and Assessment Center?

The on-site administrator appointed September, 1978, found that the renovation of the building was managed by several departments (such as heating, electrical, and plumbing) and that the on-the job foreman felt that their job was to implement plans--not make plans. This caused work stoppages since there were three different renovation plans which had not been integrated. An architect was hired to resolve this difficulty.

Students attending the MCMC in the morning were not receiving Special Education academics in their home schools because the home schools were scheduling academics when the students were attending the MCMC. This problem partially derived from the fact that academics were traditionally scheduled in the morning for Special Education students in order to avoid fatigue. Following the reporting of this information to administrative personnel, steps were initiated toward increasing the availability of basic academic instruction.

Abstract

Evaluation of the Multiple Careers Magnet and
Assessment Centers at William B. Carrell,
1978-79

Evaluators: Wayne Maples
Karen Cortell Reisman
Jenci Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy
Wayne R. Murray

Objectives of the Programs: The Multiple Careers Magnet Center (MCMC) is a part-time magnet school designed to provide special education students at the secondary level with career training. Students enter one of six career education clusters for three consecutive quarters. The objectives for each career cluster follows:

Furniture Repair and Upholstery. Students learn to repair frames and rebuild legs and spindles, etc., as needed. Training on woodworking equipment toward this purpose is provided. In addition, students learn how to upholster and refinish furniture.

General Construction Trades. Students learn techniques necessary for the construction of new buildings. Coursework includes cement work, bricklaying, carpentry, cabinetmaking, and electrical wiring. A student may remain in this program for the full three quarters or may identify a particular area of interest and skill and be transferred to a regular program (e.g., bricklaying). Students in this class will construct small prefabricated storage units.

Building and Grounds Maintenance. Emphasis is on teaching the student basic maintenance techniques for home and industry and the surrounding grounds. Students learn how to clean and wax floors, clean restrooms, make basic electrical and plumbing repairs, install window panes and learn the proper care and maintenance of landscaped areas.

Laundry and Dry Cleaning. Students are provided with the latest equipment and methods necessary for employment in the laundry and dry cleaning industry. The object of the dry cleaning course is to give the student a firm grounding in the knowledge of different fabrics in the process of dry cleaning and pressing.

Home and Community Services. Of two separate labs offered, one emphasizes food preparation while the other emphasizes commercial sewing and housekeeping. Students are provided training experiences in food service, clothing service, housekeeping management service and laundry service. After initial training students may select an area of specialized training.

Since the MCMC is a part-time magnet, students attend either morning or afternoon, spending the remainder of the day in their home school. Upon completion of three quarters at the MCMC, students may opt to (a) continue in the program, (b) receive training in a related career program in another DISD secondary school, (c) participate in on-the-job training, or (d) be placed on a job.

The Assessment Center shares the William B. Carrell facility. It is available to any special education student at the secondary level when there is some uncertainty about a career choice. The assessment is designed to help students, their parents, and others who are assisting the students, plan for realistic careers in which they are most likely to succeed. The vocational assessment is an evaluation of work values, vocational interests and aptitudes, as well as attitudes toward work and social skills. Assessment techniques include work samples, interviews, and interest and aptitude inventories. Throughout the assessment process, counselors give feedback so that students can become aware of their own strengths and interests and are therefore better able to make realistic career decisions. When students are recommended for extended assessment (beyond three weeks), they move into a special education resource room for career exploration or work adjustment. At the conclusion of assessment, recommendations for vocational training and/or employment are made.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The primary purpose of the evaluation was to collect and disseminate program information to project management as an aid for decision-making following the first two quarters of operation. Context data reported for the MCMC and Assessment Center included the characteristics of the students and staff. Whenever possible, the student characteristics were compared to the characteristics of all special education students who were potential clients of the MCMC and Assessment Center. A second context question involved examining the characteristics of the Advisory Committee for the MCMC. Process data concerned (a) what curricular experiences were available at the MCMC, (b) whether the Individual Educational Programs (IEP) were completed and instructionally functional for all MCMC students, and (c) whether there were any problems in the transportation of students to the MCMC and Assessment Center. Product data were gathered on student, parent, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC as well as the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and Assessment Center. The final evaluation question concerned the administrative tasks and/or procedures used to initiate the MCMC and Assessment Center. This information was intended to provide feedback for project management.

Sample: All students and instructors at the MCMC and Assessment Center were included in the context evaluation. The DISD Special Education data base served as the main source of student information. All instructional staff members and assessment counselors completed demographic information sheets. Site observations and interviews with all vocational instructors were used to determine which curricular experiences were available at the

MCMC. The MCMC Student Interview Form was used to interview 28 randomly selected students concerning attitudes toward the MCMC and transportation problems. The MCMC Parent Interview Form was used in a telephone survey of 20 randomly selected parents concerning attitudes toward the MCMC and transportation problems. A 15-item questionnaire was disseminated with an enclosed self-addressed envelope to 158 area professionals, local professionals, and vocational teachers to determine the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and Assessment Center. The IEP Checklist for MCMC Students was used in a random sample of 30 student's IEPs.

Evaluation Design: The context portion of the evaluation included two questions:

1. What were the demographic characteristics of students and faculty at the MCMC and Assessment Center?

2. What were the characteristics of the Advisory Committee for the MCMC?

Demographic information collected for students included sex, ethnicity, grade, age, home school, career cluster, and handicap. Information collected on the faculty included sex, ethnicity, age, degree, and teaching and/or professional experience. Information concerning the Advisory Committee was obtained from management during May, 1979.

The process portion of the evaluation included questions regarding the characteristics of the instructional programs and transportation difficulties:

3. What curricular experiences were available at the MCMC?

4. What problems, if any, were observed or reported in the transportation of students to the MCMC and Assessment Center?

5. Were the Individual Educational Programs (IEP) completed and instructionally functional for all MCMC students?

Curricular experiences were obtained from site observations and instructor interviews during May, 1979. Transportation problems were investigated via interviews with project management, personnel, and parents during April-May, 1979. The IEP Checklist for MCMC Students was used to evaluate the completeness and technical quality of the IEP objectives. On site observations, teacher interviews, and interviews with the MCMC counselor were used to verify whether the IEPs were instructionally functional.

The product portion of the evaluation focused on attitudes:

6. What were MCMC students, parents, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC?

7. What were the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and the Assessment Center?

Students were interviewed on site during May, 1979, using the MCMC Student Interview Form. Parents were interviewed by telephone during May-June, 1979, using the MCMC Parent Interview Form. DISD vocational and appraisal personnel were mailed an attitude survey in the last week of April, 1979, with 105 responding. Faculty attitudes were collected during interviews throughout the semester.

The final evaluation question concerned start-up activities:

8. What administrative tasks and/or procedures were used to initiate the MCMC and Assessment Center?

Interviews with project management and a review and synthesis of a paper written by the on-site administrator describing the start-up activities at William B. Carrell were used as the primary information sources. Additional information was obtained from other on-site staff.

Evaluation Results:

1. MCMC student body. Data pertaining to the student body were obtained from the Special Education data base as it existed June, 1979. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the MCMC, Assessment Center, and all DISD special education students at the secondary school level.

   Total enrollment for the spring semester was 64. The breakdown by handicapping condition reveals that the MCMC was serving primarily special education students who were mildly handicapped (97%). In fact, a majority of the students (58%) were either mentally retarded-educable or minimally brain injured. Only one orthopedically handicapped and one emotionally disturbed student were enrolled. No auditory-, visual-, or other health-impaired students were enrolled. Eight auditory handicapped students will be starting in the fall of 1979. Several health impaired students were referred and assessed, but they were eliminated because of safety factors. No visually handicapped student was referred.

   The MCMC distributions for sex and ethnicity were quite similar to the district distributions. The MCMC student body was 63% male. The ethnic representation was 48% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 45% White.

   The MCMC distributions for grade and age were somewhat different from the district distributions. The MCMC students ranged in age from 14 to 18 while the district high school special education students ranged in age from 13 to 22. Compared to District-wide special education enrollments, ninth and twelfth graders were under-represented while tenth and eleventh graders were over-represented. The over-representation of tenth and eleventh graders was intentional. According to state guidelines this is the optimal time for vocational training.

   Table 2 presents the home school distribution. An examination of that table reveals that the enrollment for the MCMC was distributed fairly evenly among many high schools with the largest enrollment coming from Kimball (11%). The DISD totals present the total enrollment of special education students in each home school. Comparing

Table 1

MCMC, Assessment Center and District-Wide High School Special Education Student Characteristics

Characteristic	MCMC		Assessment Center[a]		DISD[b]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex						
Female	24	37.5	48	40.0	530	33.6
Male	40	62.5	72	60.0	1046	66.4
Ethnicity						
Black	31	48.4	59	49.2	732	46.4
Hispanic	4	6.3	7	5.8	118	7.5
White	29	45.3	54	45.0	719	45.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.5
Grade						
Ninth	16	25.0	38	32.5	587	37.2
Tenth	25	39.1	37	31.6	368	23.4
Eleventh	20	31.3	30	25.6	310	19.7
Twelfth	3	4.7	12	10.3	311	19.7
Age						
13 and Under	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	1.9
14	4	6.3	19	15.8	341	21.6
15	21	32.8	37	30.8	408	25.9
16	31	48.4	33	27.5	356	22.6
17	4	6.3	18	15.0	240	15.2
18	4	6.3	9	7.5	106	6.7
19	0	0.0	3	2.5	35	2.2
20	0	0.0	1	0.8	36	2.2
21 and Over	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	0.9
Primary Handicap						
Auditory-Regional School for Deaf (0092)	0	0.0	0	0.0	101	6.4
Visual (4041)	0	0.0	1	0.8	13	0.8
Orthopedic (4042)	1	1.6	5	4.2	37	2.3
Other health impaired (4043)	0	0.0	7	5.9	29	1.8
Minimally Brain Injured (4342)	7	10.9	5	4.2	67	4.3
Mentally Retarded-Educable (4444)	30	46.9	42	35.3	402	25.5
Mentally Retarded-Trainable (4544)	5	7.8	15	12.6	248	15.7
Emotionally Disturbed (4647, 4747)	1	1.6	12	10.1	140	8.9
Emotionally Disturbed in Community Center (4947)	0	0.0	1	0.8	101	6.4
Language and/or Learning Disabled (5251)	20	31.3	31	26.1	437	27.7
TOTAL	64		120		1576	

[a] The actual total under Assessment Center characteristic totals varies due to missing data.

[b] Represents all DISD Special Education secondary school students with the primary handicaps listed under primary handicap.

Table 2

Enrollment by Home School for the MCMC and DISD
Secondary Special Education Population

Home School	MCMC		DISD Total[a] Special Education	
	N	%	N	%
Bryan Adams	4	6.3	46	4.7
W. H. Adamson	0	0.0	25	2.6
David W. Carter	6	9.4	57	5.9
EOC Complex	0	0.0	14	1.4
Hillcrest	1	1.6	70	7.2
Thomas Jefferson	3	4.7	36	3.7
Justin F. Kimball	7	10.9	46	4.7
Lincoln	5	7.8	38	3.9
James Madison	6	9.4	37	3.8
North Dallas	5	7.8	32	3.3
L. G. Pinkston	2	3.1	91	9.4
Franklin D. Roosevelt	2	3.1	31	3.2
W. W. Samuell	1	1.6	135	13.9
Seagoville	0	0.0	30	3.1
Skyline	4	6.3	53	5.5
South Oak Cliff	4	6.3	68	7.0
H. Grady Spruce	6	9.4	69	7.1
Sunset	3	4.7	32	3.3
W. T. White	3	4.7	22	2.3
Woodrow Wilson	2	3.1	40	4.1
TOTAL	64		972	

[a]Represents only the students enrolled in the above high schools and does not include students in community centers and magnet schools.

MCMC and DISD percentages, the following schools seemed over-represented: Kimball (11% MCMC vs. 5% DISD), Lincoln (8% MCMC vs. 4% DISD), Madison (9% MCMC vs. 4% DISD), and North Dallas (8% MCMC vs. 3% DISD). The following schools seemed under-represented: Hillcrest (2% MCMC vs. 7% DISD), Pinkston (3% vs. 9% DISD), and Samuell (2% vs. 14% DISD).

The presence of special programs might account for part of a school's lack of involvement in the programs available at the MCMC. The under-representation of Hillcrest might have been due to the on-site TMR (trainable mentally retarded) work activity center and the ED (emotionally disturbed) unit. Pinkston had several vocational units including a furniture repair unit for the disadvantaged which could account for its under-representation. Samuell had a large number of auditory-handicapped students (64) and the presence of the deaf education program could in part account for its under-representation.

Table 3 presents the sex, ethnicity and schedule for the career clusters. These variables were unevenly distributed across the clusters. For the morning clusters, Furniture Repair and General Construction were all male while Commercial Sewing/Housekeeping was all female. A similar pattern holds for the afternoon students. This pattern follows traditional sex stereotypes. For the morning, Furniture Repair was predominately Black (86%) while General Construction was predominately White (70%). The clusters were ethnically balanced in the afternoon with the exception of General Construction which was 67% Black.

Assessment Center client population. The Assessment Center provided vocational assessment for 120 special education students. A majority of these students were male (60%). The ethnic distribution was 49% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 45% White. Examination of Table 1 reveals that these figures were representative of the DISD Special Education sex and ethnic distributions.

The Assessment Center distribution by primary handicap was similar to the DISD Special Education distribution. Two important differences were noted. First, the Assessment Center had not assessed deaf students, and second, compared to the District population, the Assessment Center has assessed a rather high percentage of mentally retarded-educable students. The first deficit will soon be corrected since there were ten deaf education students scheduled for assessment during the summer.

Table 4 presents the number of referrals made to the Assessment Center by the home schools, the number of special education students at each high school, and the percentage of special education students referred for vocational assessment. The percentage of eligible students referred varied greatly among home schools. The following schools had a high referral rate to the Assessment Center: Lincoln (34%), Kimball (30%), EOC Complex (29%), Bryan Adams (26%), Jefferson (25%), Madison (24%), Roosevelt (23%), and Spruce (22%). The following schools had the smallest percentage of eligible students referred: Skyline (2%), Samuell (2%), Pinkston (4%), and Hillcrest (6%).

Table 3

MCMC Enrollment[a] by Career Cluster
by Time of Attendance,
Sex, and Ethnicity

	Morning Students					Afternoon Students					Cluster Totals					
	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	TOTAL
Furniture Repair and Upholstery	7	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	1	6	1	1	8
General Construction	10	0	1	2	7	6	0	4	0	2	16	0	5	2	9	16
Building and Grounds Maintenance	4	1	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	1	6	1	3	0	4	7
Laundry and Dry Cleaning	3	1	2	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	0	2	4
Food Service	2	5	5	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	4	7	7	0	4	11
Commercial Sewing/ Housekeeping	0	6	3	0	3	0	4	2	0	2	0	10	5	0	5	10
TOTALS	26	13	19	3	17	10	7	9	0	8	36	20	28	3	25	56

[a]These data were collected during April, 1979, and does not include those students staffed into the facility at a later date nor work adjustment students.

Table 4

Referrals to Assessment Center by Home School

Home School	Number of Eligible Students (Special Education)	Number Referred for Assessment	Percentage of Students Referred
Bryan Adams	46	12	26.1
W. H. Adamson	25	3	12.0
David W. Carter	57	5	8.8
EOC Complex	14	4	28.6
Hillcrest	70	4	5.7
Thomas Jefferson	36	9	25.0
J. F. Kimball	46	14	30.4
Lincoln	38	13	34.2
James Madison	37	9	24.3
North Dallas	32	4	12.5
L. G. Pinkston	91	4	4.4
Franklin D. Roosevelt	31	7	22.6
W. W. Samuell	135	2	1.5
Seagoville	30	2	6.7
Skyline	53	1	1.9
South Oak Cliff	68	7	10.3
H. Grady Spruce	69	15	21.7
Sunset	32	2	6.3
W. T. White	22	3	13.6
Woodrow Wilson	40	4	10.0

In an attempt to account for these differences, the data were broken down by assessment counselor assigned to the home school. Each assessment counselor served six or seven high schools and met with the home school Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) teams to decide which students would be referred. Thus the counselor's attitude could strongly affect how many students were referred. With the exception of Thomas Jefferson and EOC, all of the schools with high referral rates were assigned to one assessment counselor. At least part of the variance appeared to be due to that assessment counselor's willingness to assign students for referral. Other factors which could have contributed were home schools' willingness to refer to a "magnet" school, a desire to "dump" problem students on other programs, and a desire to help problem students.

MCMC and Assessment Center faculty demographics. Table 5 presents the relevant demographic characteristics. Of the six MCMC teachers, four were male and, ethnically, all were White. The average age was 45. Three of the vocational teachers were not college graduates but were teaching on vocational certificates. Two teachers had bachelor's degrees and one teacher had a master's degree. The average period of teaching and/or professional experience was 22.3 years.

Of the six Assessment Center staff members, two were male. The one Black, four White, and one Hispanic assessment staff members had an average age of 35. Three of the staff had master's degrees while the other three had doctorates. The average period of teaching and/or professional experience was 7.3 years.

2. The MCMC Task Force was chaired by Bill Wetsel, corporate personnel director of Texas Instruments. Other members of the committee included Jerry Cooper, Henry Beck Company; Tom Haden, executive director, Dale Wore; Dave Harmon, compensation manager, E Systems; Dub Hill, executive director, Building Owners and Managers Association; D. H. Howell, handicap program specialist, Office of Human Development, City of Dallas; Gene Sparks, Foster Cleaners; Bob Varnell, director of human resources, Vought Corporation; and Troy B. Williams, John K. Burch Company. This committee has held three meetings. Following an overall inspection of the facility, the committee noted that the current vocational clusters were heavily service-oriented and recommended that future expansion of the program be in non-service areas. The committee also made recommendations for the membership of the subcommittees for each vocational cluster.

The advisory committee for the Laundry and Dry Cleaning cluster held four meetings and included Gene Sparks (Chairperson), Foster Cleaners; Beatrice Brinkley, Dallas Laundry and Dry Cleaning Association; Carlton Coburn, Holiday Cleaning and Laundry; Gene Coleman, Coleman's OHM; Charles Grant, Fishburn's; Jason Hill, Turk's Craftsman Cleaners; Felix Parker, Texas Laundry and Dry Cleaning

Table 5

MCMC and Assessment Center
Faculty Demographics

Characteristic	MCMC		AC	
	N	%	N	%
Sex				
Female	2	33.3	4	66.7
Male	4	66.7	2	33.3
Ethnicity				
Black	0	0.0	1	16.7
Hispanic	0	0.0	1	16.7
White	6	100.0	4	66.7
Age				
30 and Under	1	16.7	2	33.3
31-35	1	16.7	1	16.7
36-40	1	16.7	2	33.3
41-50	1	16.7	1	16.7
51-60	1	16.7	0	0.0
61-70	1	16.7	0	0.0
Degree				
High School (Vocational Certificate)	3	50.0	0	0.0
Bachelor	2	33.3	0	0.0
Master	1	16.7	3	50.0
Doctorate	0	0.0	3	50.0
Teaching and/or Professional Experience				
1-5 Years	0	0.0	2	33.3
6-10	2	33.3	4	66.6
11-15	1	16.7	0	0.0
16-20	0	0.0	0	0.0
21-25	0	0.0	0	0.0
26-30	1	16.7	0	0.0
31 or more	2	33.3	0	0.0

Association; David Shumaker, Valet Cleaners; and Florene Turner, Flo's Cleaners. This subcommittee helped with the design of the facility and advised concerning which equipment to purchase. The members also volunteered the services of 30 professional dry cleaners as part-time teachers in the cluster.

The advisory committee for the Building and Grounds Maintenance cluster included: Dub Hill (Chairperson), executive director, Building Owners and Managers Association; and R. D. Noble, chief engineer, Sanders Campbell Properties. This committee volunteered to help find job placements for MCMC students.

Troy B. Williams of the John K. Burch Company accepted the position of chairperson for the Furniture Repair and Upholstery cluster. He volunteered to find short-term non-paid internships for the MCMC students. The rest of the committee has yet to be formed. No other subcommittees had been formed as of July, 1979.

3. The curricular experiences available at the MCMC are listed by career cluster in Table 6. Even though the program only began instruction during January, most clusters offered many of the scheduled activities. The dry cleaning cluster had a later start date in May, 1979. Most of the equipment in this cluster was steam operated and, since the safety valves for the boiler were not installed, the dry cleaning equipment was not functional. The furniture repair section of the Furniture Repair and Upholstery cluster and the non-carpentry sections of the General Construction cluster have yet to be initiated.

4. Regular magnet school buses were used for transportation. As part of student management, a record of arrival and departure times were maintained for both morning and afternoon students. Since buses were identified in this record, it was possible to determine whether magnet buses were punctual in delivering and picking up students. Table 7 presents the percentage of times the home school buses were late and the average period of time that the buses were late for students attending the MCMC in the morning. Table 8 presents the same information for students attending the MCMC in the afternoon.

   An examination of Table 7 reveals that there were relatively minor problems transporting morning students. The Kimball, Spruce, and W. T. White buses delivered students late at least 32% of the time. The North Dallas and Skyline buses picked up students late 43% and 26% of the time, respectively.

   An examination of Table 8 reveals that for afternoon students there were severe scheduling problems. With few exceptions, afternoon students were delivered 30 or more minutes late and, in many cases, were picked up 50 or more minutes late. In addition, the afternoon students always had approximately an hour wait before the buses began the trip back to the home schools. This hour was spent either in the building or on the bus. Magnet buses make a circuit of all magnet schools before beginning the trip to the home schools; thus,

Table 6

MCMC Career Cluster Activities[a]

Career Cluster	Cluster Activities
Building and Grounds Maintenance	Cleaning: dusting, sweeping, window washing, carpet cleaning, floor waxing Gardening: site selection, soil preparation, planting, pruning, grass cutting, raking Plumbing: cutting and threading pipe, changing washers, clearing drains with auger Carpentry: door hanging, sheetrocking, wall paneling, puttying Electrical repairs: changing fuses, flourescent and incandescent lights, splicing wire Painting and paper hanging Glazing: cutting and installing plexiglass, replacing damaged screens
Dry Cleaning and Laundry	Sorting clothing Use of commercial washing machine Spot removal Use of hand press for ironing
Furniture Repair and Upholstery	Sewing blind stitch Measuring and cutting fabric Making slip covers and furniture buttons Placing buttons Spring tying Use of all upholstery tools
General Construction[b]	General carpentry: Use of hand tools such as claw hammer, folding rule, plane, screwdriver, spirit level and framing square Identifying construction woods and their uses Flooring, wall construction, roofing, wall covering, molding and finishing.
Food Service	Equipment usage: industrial dishwasher, electric and gas range, confection oven, food warmer, commerical food mixer, microwave range, freezer, waffle iron, and cash register

[a] Though not listed, all students had considerable exposure to relevant safety rules and their respective vocational vocabulary.

Table 6 (Cont'd.)

	General skills: knowledge of proportioning in foods, weighing and measuring ingredients, reading recipes, sanitation, serving guests, setting tables, busing, filling out job applications, computing weekly salary, and handling money
Commercial Sewing/ Homemaking	Sewing: using home and power machines, using shears, laying out and measuring patterns Home laundry: sorting clothing, spot removal, use of washer and dryer, ironing Home cleaning: dishes, carpeting, windows, refrigerator, dusting, cleaning bathroom, bedroom and kitchen Personal hygiene and grooming

[b]Students applied their general carpentry skills to successfully complete and sell a pre-fabricated storage shed. The non-carpentry sections were not introduced due to the late program start. These skills include cement work, bricklaying, cabinet making, and simple electrical wiring.

120

Table 7

Morning Arrival and Departure Times

Home School	Arrival		Departure	
	Late[a] (%)	Mean Late Arrival Time	Late[b] (%)	Mean Late Departure Time
Bryan Adams	0	-	3	12:46 p.m.
Buckner (Skyline)	12	9:22 a.m.	26	12:36 p.m.
Hillcrest	0	-	4	12:33 p.m.
Justin F. Kimball	33	9:21 a.m.	0	-
Lincoln	0	-	3	12:45 p.m.
James Madison	8	9:20 a.m.	0	-
North Dallas	0[c]	-	43	12:30 p.m.
H. Grady Spruce	32	9:20 a.m.	10	12:41 p.m.
Thomas Jefferson	6	9:35 a.m.	6	12:40 p.m.
W. T. White	32	9:26 a.m.	0	-

[a] Even though class was scheduled at 9:00 a.m., a liberal approach was taken and a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 9:15 a.m.

[b] Officially, departure time was noon, but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 12:15 p.m.

[c] The North Dallas bus arrived before 8:45 a.m. 74% of the time. It has arrived as early as 8:00 a.m.

Table 8

Afternoon Arrival and Departure Times

Home School	Arrival		Departure	
	Late[a] (%)	Mean Late Arrival Time	Late[b] (%)	Mean Late Departure Time
Bryan Adams	75	12:56 p.m.	22	4:37 p.m.
Buckner (Skyline)	97	1:14 p.m.	8	4:55 p.m.
Justin F. Kimball	17	12:52 p.m.	16	4:32 p.m.
James Madison	31	12:56 p.m.	42	4:26 p.m.
L. G. Pinkston	94	12:59 p.m.	61	3:54 p.m.
Franklin D. Roosevelt	97	1:02 p.m.	87	4:16 p.m.
H. Grady Spruce	89	1:03 p.m.	100	4:28 p.m.
Thomas Jefferson	14	12:54 p.m.	48	3:54 p.m.
Woodrow Wilson	0	-	86	4:33 p.m.

[a] Arrival time was scheduled for 12:30 p.m., but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 12:45 p.m.

[b] Departure time was scheduled for 3:30 p.m., but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 3:45 p.m.

William B. Carrell's position in the circuit determined how much time was spent in the building and how much time was spent on the bus. When a home school bus making the circuit of magnet schools stopped at William B. Carrell at the beginning of its circuit, the students spent their hour's wait in the building. When a home school bus stopped at William B. Carrell at the end of its circuit, the students spent their hour's wait on the bus making the circuit. At least part of the problem derived from the fact that the students at William B. Carrell had a scheduled afternoon departure time of 3:30 p.m., thirty minutes earlier than any other magnet school. On the basis of this information, the afternoon schedule for 1979-80 has been changed to 1 p.m.-4 p.m.

No other problem was reported by the staff. Interviews with parents revealed that, although they were aware of the time their children left and returned home, they were generally not aware of the problems encountered in the transportation of their children to and from the home schools to the magnet school.

5. The Individual Educational Programs (IEP) were completed and instructionally functional in April, 1979. A random sample of 30 IEPs were inspected for the technical quality of the objectives listed for each student. The objectives listed were checked for the presence of a terminal behavior, observational method, behavioral criterion, initiation date and attainment date. Not all the objectives incorporated these criteria. The strongest technical aspect of the IEPs was the presence of a terminal behavior defining the student objective. For 27 (90%) of the IEPs, all the objectives listed a terminal behavior. The weakest technical aspect of IEPs was the listing of an attainment date. For 18 (60%) of the IEPs, defect was due to teachers assuming that the end of the year was the attainment date (unless otherwise stated). The objectives listed on the IEP seem to be realistic estimates of student's potential. That the objectives were attained was verified by on-site visits of the classroom, student interviews (see Table 9, item 3), and conversations with the student counselor.

6. Student, parent, and faculty attitudes towards the MCMC were highly favorable. During May of 1979, 28 students were randomly chosen for interviews. Table 9 presents the student interview form with a breakdown of student responses to each question. The students were happy in school: 96% liked their teacher; 89% felt the teacher liked them; 92% were happy in their career cluster, and 92% would want their friends to be able to go to the MCMC. When the students were asked what their parents thought of them being in their career cluster, 57% responded that their parents liked the cluster while 11% responded that their parents felt that the cluster was all right.

Several questions gathered data on the student's job related attitudes. For students planning to get a job after graduation, 18 (82%) students plan to get a job in the career cluster area while 4 (18%) plan to get a job in a non-career area. Four students had no job plans. For the 19 students answering why they were happy to be in their cluster, the following responses were given:

Table 9

MCMC Student Interviews

N	%	Interview Question[a] and Subject Response[b]
		1. Do you like _____ as a teacher?
27	96	YES
1	4	NO
		2. Does _____ (cluster teacher) like you?
11	39	YES (unmodified response by student)
14	50	YES (I GUESS SO, I THINK)
1	4	NO
2	7	no response

3. What have you learned in your cluster? Can you show something you have learned to do?

The following list is organized by cluster. Each line represents a different student's answer.

Clothing and home laundry student response:

USE WASHING MACHINE, CLEAN BATHROOM; GENERAL CLEANING.
LAUNDRY, SEW CORRECTLY, GENERAL CLEANING, MAKE-UP CARE.
STITCHING, MAKING PURSE & APRON, IRONING, CLEANING, GROOMING.
OPERATE COMMERCIAL SEWING MACHINE, HEMMING, MAKING CLOTHES.
SEWING, GENERAL CLEANING, CLEAN BATHROOM.

Building and Grounds Maintenance student response:

REMOVING PAINT.
PUT DOWN CARPET, GARDENING, USE BUFFER, CLEAN BATHROOMS.
no response.

General Construction Trades student response:

USE TOOLS, PULL WALLS, MAKE FIREWALL, STUDS AND TABLES.
PUT HOUSE TOGETHER, USE EQUIPMENT, SAFETY RULES, SHARPEN AND CLEAN TOOLS.
PUT HOUSE TOGETHER, USE TOOLS.
CUT STRAIGHT LINE, NAIL STRAIGHT, READ RULER, DRAW PLAN, DO ROOF.
USE BALANCE, PUT THINGS TOGETHER.
HOW TO MEASURE, PUT THINGS TOGETHER, NAME TOOLS, MAKE CUTS, WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE.
no response

[a] The interview questions are italicized. Interpretive comments to the reader are in standard lower-case type.

[b] Student responses are in upper-case standard type.

N	%	
		Laundry and Dry Cleaning student response:
		LEARN HOW TO PRESS PANTS & SHIRTS, SPOTTING (SPOT REMOVAL), WASHING, TAKING CLOTHES IN.
		IRONING.
		Furniture Repair and Upholstery student response:
		FIXING CHAIRS, USE TACK HAMMER, MAKE BUTTONS.
		PUT CHAIRS TOGETHER, UPHOLSTERY, USE TACK HAMMER & TACK KNUCKLE TO REMOVE TACKS, MAKE BUTTONS.
		PUT CHAIRS TOGEGETHER, USE TACK HAMMER, USE CLAMP.
		no response
		Food Service student response:
		COOK MEXICAN FOOD, COOK CAKES, MAKE COOKIES, SOUP & SPAGHETTI.
		COOKING, USE STOVE.
		KNOW HOW MUCH (INGREDIENTS) TO PUT IN, (USE) MEASURING CUPS, MIXING, (USE) POTS, PANS AND DISHES.
		SET TABLES, MAKE BETTER FOODS, DO DISHES.
		MEASURE, WEIGH, LEARN NEW RECIPIES, HOW TO SEASON MEATS.
		Work Adjustment student response:
		MAKE JEWELRY, COOK, SEW.
		no response.
		4. *Are you happy to be in _____ cluster? Why?*
26	92	YES
1	4	NO
1	4	no response
		Of the 26 students who responded that they were happy in their cluster, the following reasons were given:
8	31	I AM LEARNING A TRADE.
7	27	IT IS FUN (in the cluster).
2	8	I AM LEARNING (work) SKILLS.
1	4	I LIKE THE TEACHER.
1	4	I LIKE THE STUDENTS.
7	27	no response.
		5. *Would you want your friends to go here too?*
26	92	YES
2	8	NO
		6? *What are you planning to do when you get out of school permanently?*
18	69	PLAN TO GET JOB IN CAREER CLUSTER AREA.

[c]Two Work Adjustment students were not included since they were not in a career cluster.

Table 9 (Cont'd.)

N	%	
4	15	PLAN TO GET JOB IN NON-CAREER CLUSTER AREA.
4	15	NO PLAN.
		7. If you had your choice, would you rather continue in school or quit and go to work now?
16	57	CONTINUE IN SCHOOL.
10	36	QUIT AND WORK.
2	7	no response
		8. If you were allowed, would you rather stay in _____(present cluster) or get into another cluster? Where?
20	71	STAY.
5	18	GO.
3	11	no response
		9. How did you choose this school?
2	7	VAC RECOMMENDATION.
12	43	HOMESCHOOL TEACHER RECOMMENDATION.
9	32	HOMESCHOOL COUNSELOR RECOMMENDATION.
1	4	PARENT'S CHOICE
4	14	no response
		10. Do you currently work? Where?
9	32	YES
19	68	NO
		For the nine students who currently work, four work in their career cluster area.
		11. What does your father do for a living? What does your mother do for a living?
7	25	Students with a parent working in student's career cluster area.
17	61	Students with parents working in an area not related.
4	14	no response.
		12. What do your parents think of your being in this cluster?
16	57	THEY LIKE IT
3	11	OK
9	32	DO NOT KNOW

126

Table 9 (Cont'd.)

For the students reporting that their parents like them being in the cluster, the following comments were volunteered:

MOTHER WANTS ME TO GET A TRADE.

FATHER THINKS IT IS GOOD TO LEARN A TRADE.

FATHER LIKES BECAUSE I CAN HELP AROUND HOUSE (general construction student).

IT IS GOOD TO BE ABLE TO BUILD HOUSE.

BEST THING FOR ME.

THEY WANT ME TO HAVE A TRADE.

(a) 8 (42%) that they were learning a trade; (b) 2 (11%) that they were learning useful work skills; and (c) 7 (37%) that the cluster activities were fun. Only 10 students responded that they would quit because they thought they could get a job with the cluster training they had already received. One of the assessment counselors expressed a fear that students might choose a cluster because it was the only area to which they had been exposed (e.g., a person might choose the General Construction cluster because his father was a carpenter). A similar idea was expressed by a parent concerned about the appropriateness of his daughter training to be a janitor such as himself. To examine this notion, students were asked what their father and mother did for a living. Of those students who were aware of their parents' profession, 29% had a parent working in a cluster related area; therefore, there was support for that idea.

Interviews with parents revealed that they were pleased with the MCMC. When asked whether they would recommend the school to other parents, 90% responded positively, and 10% responded that it was too early to know. In general, parents recommended the MCMC because (a) their children were happy, (b) teachers were interested in their children, and/or, (c) their children were learning a trade. Most parents felt that their children were better behaved, had better attitudes, or were more self-confident due to their experiences at the MCMC.

Much of the positive parent and student attitudes probably derived from this warm atmosphere. Teachers knew all the students in the building by name. They were concerned about the welfare of the student (as revealed by teacher conversations during break periods). Students were encouraged to be independent and to achieve to their limits. Project management encouraged this atmosphere in order to achieve self-growth and self-esteem in students.

7. Professionals (105) from several disciplines completed the MCMC and Assessment Center Survey, and for the purposes of this question, they were divided into the following three groups: (a) 31 area professionals including administrators, coordinators, special educational and occupational facilitators, area level counselors, home-school coordinators, and psychologists; (b) 57 local professionals including diagnosticians and local level counselors, home-school coordinators, and psychologists; and (c) 17 vocational teachers including vocational adjustment coordinators and work activity teachers. All respondents knew the site location. All of the teachers, 90% of the area professionals, and 67% of local professionals had visited William B. Carrell since its renovation, and only 43% of the local professionals were aware of the transportation stipulation which required that MCMC students be bused from their neighborhood high schools. Only orthopedically handicapped students were bused directly from their homes to school.

   Concerning program guidelines, most of the teachers (94%) and nearly two-thirds of the local and area professionals (63% and 65%, respectively) responded that they knew that the Assessment Center was designed to evaluate students' ability to benefit from <u>any</u> district-wide vocational program. An MCMC policy states that students must be enrolled in the program for three consecutive quarters. When asked whether this restricted the number of referable students, the responses were evenly divided between "yes" and "no" indicating no consistent pattern relative to this question. A similar inconsistent opinion pattern was evidenced when the professionals were asked whether the vocational programs at the MCMC limited the number of eligible students that could be referred.

   Concerning communications, the majority of the professionals responded that they were receiving literature about the MCMC. Although 86% of the local professionals stated that they had received literature about the MCMC, only 58% stated that they felt knowledgeable about the program. When asked whether they had received feedback on students in vocational units at the MCMC, about half of the local professionals (45%) and about two-thirds of the teachers (64%) replied positively. The fact that teachers received more feedback than local professionals could have resulted from the fact the local professionals did not see students on a routine, daily basis. A similar pattern of responses was evidenced when the professionsls were asked whether they had received feedback on students in the Assessment Center.

8. <u>Renovation of the facility</u>. Renovation was delayed by a lack of overall planning. Three different renovation plans were drawn up by administrators responsible for different aspects of the program (e.g., VEH units, homemaking units, and special education classrooms). When the on-site administrator was appointed in September, 1978, she found that the renovation was managed by several departments (such as heating, electrical, and plumbing) and the on-the-job foremen felt that their job was to implement the plans--not make decisions. She also found that the workmen needed information on

the size and electrical requirements of capital equipment (110 volt versus 220 volt system). This information could only be obtained from Purchasing. These two factors often caused work stoppages.

Conflicts between renovation plans were resolved when an architect was assigned to integrate the separate renovation plans following a meeting between all on-site supervisors, the Assistant Superintendent of Support Services, and the on-site administrator. To resolve questions concerning capital equipment, the on-site administrator ordered copies of all plans, specifications, purchase orders, and bids.

Student academics. Students attended the MCMC in either the morning or afternoon. But since special education academics (e.g., English, Reading, Math, History, Science) are traditionally offered in the morning, it was suspected that students attending the MCMC in the morning might be missing their academics. An examination of home school academics revealed that for students attending the MCMC in the morning, 27% had no academic class, 36% had one academic class, and the remaining 37% had two or more academic classes. In sharp contrast to these figures, for students attending the MCMC in the afternoon, 100% had at least one academic class while 87% had two or more academic classes. Following the transmission of this information to Special Education Administrative personnel steps were initiated toward increasing the availability of basic academic instruction.

Googles

Multiple Careers Magnet Center (MCMC) and Assessment Center at William B. Carrell

1. The MCMC provided vocational training for 64 mildly handicapped secondary students during the spring semester.

2. The Assessment Center provided vocational assessment for 120 special education students.

3. Class schedule revisions in the MCMC improved the daily transportation delays experienced by students.

4. Students who attended the MCMC in the morning had considerably less opportunity for academic instruction than those who attended the MCMC in the afternoon.

5. Students, parents, and faculty reacted very favorably to the MCMC.

Reference:

Maples, W., Reisman, K. C., Kocsis, J., Macy, D. J., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Centers at William B. Carrell, Research Report No. SP79-434-31-08. Dallas: Dallas Independent School District, October, 1979.